This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ARIES
301 7

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOLUME XIII.—1860–61.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.:

GEORGE TUTTLE, 78 STATE STREET.

NEW YORK: H. B. PRICE, 884 BROADWAY.

LONDON: TRUBNER & CO., 12 PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1861.

Printed by
TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE & TAYLOR,
New Haven, Conn.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII.

NO. I.

ART. I.—Philosophy and the Knowledge of God, . . 1

1. Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Edinburgh University. Arranged and Edited by O. W. Wight, &c. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1853. 8vo. pp. 530.

2. Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, by Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Edited by the Rev. Henry L. Mansel, B. D., Oxford, and John Veitch, M. A., Edinburgh: in two Vols. Vol. I, Metaphysics. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. 8vo. pp. 718—738.

3. Limits of Religious Thought, Examined in Eight Lectures before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCLVIII, on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalene College—Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. First American, from the third London edition, with the Notes translated. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1859. 12mo., pp. 362.

4. What is Revelation? a series of Sermons on the Epiphany; to which are added, Letters to a Student of Theology on the Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel. By the Rev. Frederick Dennison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, Cambridge. Macmillan & Co., and 23 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, 1859. 12mo., pp. 480.

5. Elements of Intellectual Philosophy. Designed for a Text Book, and for Private Reading. By Hubbard Winslow, D D., author of Philosophical Tracts, Social, Civil Duties, &c. Boston: Hinckling, Swan & Brewer, 1858. 12mo., pp. 414.

ART. II.—New Gospel in New England, and the Church, 48

ART. III.—Bishop Griswold on the Apostolic Office, 64

ART. IV.—The Moravians, ... 80

1. The Fourth Centennial Anniversary of the Moravian Church, Philadelphia, 1857. 12mo.

2. The Moravian Manual. By E. de Schweinitz, Pastor of the Franklin street Moravian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, Publishers, 1859. pp. 178. 12mo.

3. Acta Fratrum Unitatis in Anglia. London: Printed in the year MDCCXLIX. 4to., pp. 156.

4. A Memorial of the Dedication of Monuments erected by the Moravian Historical Society, to mark the sites of Ancient Missionary Stations in New York and Connecticut. New York: C. B. Richardson, Office of the Historical Magazine, 348 Broadway. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1860. 8vo., pp. 185.

ART. V.—English Reformation: The Nag's-Head Story, 98

1. P. F. Courayer's Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, &c. 2 vols. London, 1728.

2. The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined, &c. By the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick. Philadelphia, 1841.

ART. VI.—Free Churches, ... 118

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

Early Journals of General Conventions, (Continued,) 138

Notices of Books, ... 163

1 Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures—2. Huntington's Sermons.—3. Turnbull's Christ in History.—4. Appleton's Cyclopedia.—5. Cooper's Novels.—6. Binney's Washington's Farewell Address.—7. Seabury's Sermon on Conscience.—8. Moore's Treason of Gen. Lee.—9. King's White Hills.—10. Diary of a Samaritan.—11. Tenney's Geology.—12. Smiles' Self-Help.—13. Collin's Queen of Hearts.—14. Murray's Preachers and Preaching.—15. Pronouncing Bible.—16. Dr. Oldham.—17. Annual of Discovery.—18. Carlton & Porter's Publications.—19. Miss Babcock's Hidden Treasure.—20. Biblical Reason Why.—21. Nicholson's Gospel Thoughts.—22. Life and Times of Sam. Dale.—23. Norton's Lectures on David.—24. Howitt's Popular History of the United States.—25. Thornbury's Life in Spain.—26. American Almanac.—27. Hoffman's Weekly Eucharist.—28. Young's Hymns for Children.—29. Abbott's Peter the Great.—30. Bonnell's Lecture on the word "Catholic."—31. Correspondence on Original Sin and the Trinity.—32. Sampson's Spiritualism Tested.—33. Reports, Catalogues, Sermons, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 177

Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ... 184

NO. II.

ART. I.—The Present State and Prospects of Christianity.—No. III. 193

The Fortunes of the Hebrew Nation and the Christian Church.

ART. II.—About Dr. Oldham at Greystones, and his Talk there, ... 211

Dr. Oldham at Greystones and his Talk there: New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1860. 12mo., pp. 342.

ART. III.—The Church and the Denominations, . 220

1. The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches. By James Benign Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, &c. In two Vols. New York: John Doyle. 1842.

2. The Causes and the Cure of Puseyism, or the Elementary Principles of Roman Error detected in the Liturgy, Offices, Homilies and Usages of the Episcopal Churches in England and America: with a Proposed Remedy. By Ira Warren. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1847.

3. Address on Ministerial Union. By T. H. Stockton, Pastor of the Church of the New Testament. Philadelphia: 1859.

ART. IV.—English Reformation: the Nag's-Head Story, (Concluded,) 236

ART. V.—Romish Perverts: Where they Come from? 254

ART. VI.—Two Letters to Monseigneur Parisis, Bishop of Arras, ... 266

Histoire du Bienheureux Pierre Claver, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Par J. M. S. Daurignac. Deuxiéme Edition. Lyon: 1855. 2 vols. 12mo.

ART. VII.—Pews, ... 284

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

Early Journals of General Conventions, (Continued,) 301

Notices of Books, ... 318

1. Life of Bishop Wilson.—2. Burnet's Protestant Lawyer, &c.—3. Godwin's History of France.—4. Bengel's Gnomon.—5. Hase's Life of Jesus.—6. Steven's History of Georgia.—7. Hopkin's Puritans. 8. Oliphant's Narrative of Mission to China.—9. Cooper's Novels.—10. Wilson's Presbyterian Almanac.—11. Hundley's Southern States. 12. Bell's Knowledge of Living Things.—13. Allen's Clergy in Maryland.—14. Appleton's Cyclopedia.—15. Will's Old Leaves.—16. Morrison's Notes on the Gospels.—17. Nichols' Fragments.—18. Sheahan's Life of Douglass.—19. Gotthold's Emblems.—20. Mill on the Floss.—21. Juvenal's Satires.—22. Harper's School Readers.—23. Mitchell's Ancient Geography.—24. Mitchell's Intermediate Geography.—25. Sunday Enjoyments.—26. Timbs' Stories of Inventors. 27. Wood's Tune Book.—28. Bishop Lay's Sermon.—29. Sermons, Catalogues, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER:

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 333

Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ... 341

Erratum and Editorial Note, ... 360

NO. III.

ART. I.—The Present State and Prospects of Christianity, No. III.—(Concluded,) 361

The Fortunes of the Hebrew Nation and the Christian Church.

ART. II.—Green's Biographical Studies, . . . 381

Biographical Studies. By George Washington Greene. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1860. 12mo., pp. 233.

ART. III.—The Church Missionary Position of 1835 and Voluntaryism, ... 390

1. Journals of General Conventions of 1835 and 1859.
2. Address to their Brethren of the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Lay Committee appointed at the Session of the General Convention, October, 1859. Philadelphia: 1860. 8vo., pp. 23.
3. Constitution, &c., of a New Missionary Society in 1860.

ART. IV.—Two Letters to Monseigneur Parisis, Bishop of Arras, ... 423

Histoire du Bienheureux Pierre Claver, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Par J. M. S. Daurignac. Deuxiéme Edition. Lyon: 1855. 2 vols., 12mo.

ART. V.—Dr. F. D. Huntington's Sermon and the Trinity, 451

1. Christian Believing and Living. Sermons by F. D. Huntington, D. D., &c., &c.
2. The Christian Examiner. March, 1860.

ART. VI.—Dr. Craik's Discourse on the Union, . . 463

The Union. National and State Sovereignty alike essential to American Liberty. A Discourse delivered in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at the Capitol in Frankfort, Ky., December 9, 1859. By the Rev. James Craik, D. D.

ART. VII.—The Free Church System, ... 484

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

Early Journals of General Conventions, (Continued,) 517

Notices of Books, ... 535

1 Mahan's Church History.—2. Gibson's Year of Grace.—3. Bishop Whittingham on Baptismal Regeneration.—4. Milman's Latin Christianity.—5. Carlyle's Essays.—6. Queens of Society.—7. Lamson's Church of the First Three Centuries.—8. Unity and its Restoration.—9. Huntington's Sunday School and the Church.—10. Craik's Old and New.—11. Lovel, the Widower.—12. Cooper's Novels.—13. Trollope's West Indies, &c.—14. Kip's Army Life on the Pacific.—15. Abbot's History of Genjhis Khan.—16. Lewes' Studies in Animal Life.—17. Rosa, the Parisian Girl.—18. Smith's History of Greece.

—19. Hooker's Natural History.—20. Owen's Commentary.—21. Hackett's Illustrations of Scripture.—22. Harper's Edition of Latin and Greek Classics.—23. Thompson's Hours in Patmos.—24. Church Book Society's Publications.—25. Caverly Family.—26. Dissenter's Testimony to Confirmation.—27. Tomlinson's Good Way.—28. Coxe's The Church and the Press.—29. Address of the Laity.—30. Sermons, &c. &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER :

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 548

Correction, ... 552

NO. IV.

ART. I.—Limits of Thought, ... 553

1. Lectures on Metaphysics. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

2. The Limits of Religious Thought examined in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1858, on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

ART. II.—George S. Yerger, ... 577

ART. III.—Lord Macaulay and Bishop Burnet, . . 593

1. Burnet's History of his own Times.

2. Baron Macaulay's History of England.

ART. IV.—Spurgeon and his Sermons, ... 605

ART. V.—R. T. S. Lowell's Poems, ... 611

Fresh Hearts that failed Three Thousand Years Ago; with other Things. By the author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay." Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

ART. VI.—Laymen's Rights, ... 624

Letter from a Layman to the Editor.

ART. VII.—The Position of Romanism in America, 636

1. Pastoral Letter of Nine Romish-American Bishops on Italian Affairs. New York. 1860.

2. Brownson's Quarterly Review. New York.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY :

Early Journals of General Conventions, (Concluded,) 660

Notices of Books, ... 677

1. Essays and Reviews.—2. Lord Bacon's Works.—3. Milman's History of Latin Christianity.—4. Hengstenberg's Commentary.—5. Flem-

ing's Vocabulary of Philosophy.—6. Webster's American Dictionary.—7. Mansel's Prolegomena Logica.—8. Hamilton's Lectures on Logic.—9. Stier on the Words of Jesus.—10. Bickersteth on the Rock of Ages.—11. Farrar's Science in Theology.—12. Burton's Lake Regions of Central Africa.—13. Atkinson's Upper and Lower Amoor.—14. Quitman's Life and Correspondence.—15. Cooper's Novels.—16. Lyon's Christian Songs.—17. New American Cyclopedia.—18. Eames' Budget Closed.—19. Life, &c., of Bishop Doane.—20. Farley's Unitarianism Defined.—21. Faraday on Physical Forces.—22.—Everett's Life of Washington.—23. Norton's Life of Washington.—24. Ayer on the Benefit of Christ's Death.—25. A Man.—26. Historical Pictures Retouched.—27. Thackeray's Four Georges.—28. Arthur's Italy in Transition.—29. Abbott's Florence Stories.—30. Ellis' Chapters on Wives.—31. Reid's Odd People.—32. Cornell's How to enjoy Life.—33. Strickland's Old Mackinaw.—34. Belisle's History of Independence Hall.—35. Tyler on the Bible and Social Reform.—36. Miss Mulock's Our Year.—37. Roger's Address.—38. Haskin's Pastoral Offering.—39. Address of the Laity.—40. Bishop Otey's Sermon.—41. Sermons, Reports, &c., &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER :

Summary of Home Intelligence, ... 697

Summary of Foreign Intelligence, ... 706

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XIII. APRIL, 1860. No. 1.

ART. I. PHILOSOPHY AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

1.—*Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Edinburgh University.* Arranged and edited by O. W. WIGHT, &c. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y., 1853. 8vo. pp. 530.

2.—*Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, by Sir William Hamilton, Bart.* Edited by the Rev. HENRY L. MANSEL, B. D., Oxford, and JOHN VEITCH, M. A., Edinburgh, in two Vols. Vol. I, Metaphysics. Boston, Gould & Lincoln, 1859. 8vo., pp. 718—738.

3.—*Limits of Religious Thought, Examined in Eight Lectures before the University of Oxford, in the year* MDCCCLVIII, *on the Bampton Foundation.* By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalene College—Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. First American from the third London edition, with the notes translated. Boston, Gould & Lincoln, 1859. 12mo., pp. 362.

4.—*What is Revelation? a series of Sermons on the Epiphany; to which are added, Letters to a Student of Theology on the Bampton Lectures of Mr. Mansel.* By the Rev. FREDERICK DENNISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, Cambridge. Macmillan & Co., and 23 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, 1859. 12mo., pp. 480.

5.—*Elements of Intellectual Philosophy. Designed for a Text-Book, and for Private Reading.* By HUBBARD WINSLOW, D. D., author of Philosophical Tracts, Social, Civil Duties, &c. Boston, Hinckling, Swan & Brewer, 1858. 12mo., pp. 414.

Something like a year ago we took up the general subject of the relations of Philosophy to Revelation, and investigated them on *one side*, in a couple of articles on "Theodore Parker and the Newest Theology." Our object at that time was, besides some special criticism on Mr. Parker in particular, to show that *Idealism*, under all its forms, and by whatever name called, tends to subvert faith in a Revelation, properly so called, and to substitute for a salutary Theism, the belief in one God, Who is the Creator and Moral Governor of the Universe, a vicious Pantheism, and a total relaxation of all moral and religious obligations.

We recur to our general subject in the present Article, for the purpose of examining the claims and tendencies of philosophical schools and speculations of another class, and we have, with this object in view, named some of the most important and significant works that have recently appeared in this interest. The work of Mr. Mansel claims to carry out the principles of Sir William Hamilton. Mr. Maurice's work claims to be an answer to that of Mr. Mansel. Dr. Winslow's work was published before those of Mansel and Maurice, and is here cited as containing what we believe to be the germ of a better system, although growing out of what is known as the "Scotch School," and of which we believe it to be a truer and better representation than even Sir William Hamilton himself.

The two works which are, therefore, more immediately before our minds, are those of Mr. Mansel and Mr. Maurice. With the *object* of both of these we most heartily sympathize.

It is to secure a proper and reverential regard for the Holy Scriptures as a revelation from God, to preserve the integrity of the "faith once delivered to the saints," and by the Church retained and taught in our day. We sympathize with them, to the fullest extent, in their dislike and disapproval of Idealism, Rationalism and Pantheism, in all their varied forms and tendencies, as utterly subversive of the very basis of sound morality and sanctifying piety. But we cannot agree with them in their fundamental principles. They propose nothing essentially new, or radically different from what has been taught as long as Platonism, which is, in fact, the foundation of all Idealism and Pantheism, even though possibly they are older than Plato himself. They only give us a new statement and renewed affirmations of what has been stated and affirmed repeatedly, and of what, we must add, has been proved, both by logical deduction and historical development, to be inadequate to the object they have in view; nay, worse—proven to be wrong in fact and in principle, and to lead to results which, however unlike those of Idealism, in some respects are scarcely, if at all, better for the highest interests of mankind.

Mr. Mansel is, in theory and general doctrine, a Sensationalist, however he may, in special cases and statements, adopt or inculcate precepts not in accordance with the general tenor of the Sensational School. In order to guard against Rationalism and its infidel consequences, he would deny that the idea of God belongs to Philosophy at all; that the human mind can form any idea of such a being, except as that idea is derived either from revelation or by tradition from other minds; that, therefore, we cannot reason about Him, His attributes and nature at all, except as we may develop what is given us by this revelation or by tradition; and that hence, for all we know of God and His relations to men, we must depend on the Holy Scriptures. And in this way he thinks to secure a most devout and profound reverence for that Sacred Volume and for the authority of its teachings. In this aim, we certainly and most heartily sympathize. And doubtless his work will do much to increase this devout and reverential regard in the hearts of many of his readers, for which they will thank him, and God will bless him.

Mr. Maurice, on the other hand, belongs essentially to the School of Sentimentalists or Mystics. He holds and emphatically and eloquently insists, that on Mr. Mansel's theory we cannot be said to *know God* at all; we can have no personal insight, sense or feeling of His existence; we can have, at the utmost, only a bare intellectual knowledge of the fact that there is a God—that He exists—but that *Himself* we cannot know, and that of Him no revelation has been made, or can be made. Mr. Maurice insists that the whole tenor of Scripture and the constant teaching of religious experience, is that God has made a revelation of Himself, not only in the Holy Scriptures, but in the heart of the believer, in his sentiments and feelings; that this knowledge of God, though not by any means so adequate, is nevertheless as real, as direct, and as immediate as that of any other object of knowledge or of thought whatever.

Now we certainly sympathize with Mr. Maurice in this, but we doubt if Mr. Mansel would adopt, as his own inferences, what Mr. Maurice has ascribed to him. And whether he would or would not, his work is no answer to either Mr. Mansel's conclusions from his premises, nor yet to his premises themselves. He denies the conclusion stoutly, vehemently, and with reiteration, but he fails to show that it is not perfectly legitimate, or that the premises are not impregnable.

Of Mr. Maurice's system, or first principles, we propose no discussion here. He simply makes feeling the confidence of certainty, the test of truth; a test which may, of course, vary with every individual; which may legitimate one system of theology as well as another; and which may be appealed to, and has been appealed to, to sustain every system, Christian or heathen, that has been, or can be believed or offered to the faith or the credulity of man.

Of this system we said something in the articles on Theodore Parker already referred to,* to which we beg to refer; and with this reference we shall leave this part of our subject for the present.

There are many who believe that there should be no connection between Philosophy and Theology. We have no doubt

* P. 25, et. seq. April No., 1859.

that much of the success and popularity of Mr. Mansel's book arises from the belief that he sympathizes with this view, and has written in its interest. We do not now remember any passage in the work before us that distinctly inculcates this opinion, and if there were, it would contradict the general import and purpose of the book itself. The fact is, and is undeniable —and we may as well familiarize our minds with it first as last —that there can be no Theology, natural or revealed, except through Philosophy. Mr. Maurice does not, for one moment, suppose there can; he only proposes to substitute one Philosophy as the basis, handmaid and interpreter of Theology for another,—Sir William Hamilton's for that of the German Rationalists and Pantheists.

But let us consider, for a moment, the position taken. *Natural Theology* is, beyond question, a branch and product of Philosophy or Metaphysical Science. It grows out of and depends upon our interpretation of the facts of Nature and the Human Mind; and that interpretation is but the application of our Philosophy to those facts. When we assume that "evidences of design imply a designing Mind,"—"every effect must have had an adequate cause"—we are drawing from and applying our Philosophy—axioms of Philosophy perhaps—in which all schools are agreed, and which, from having never been disputed, have hardly been regarded as belonging to the scope and sphere of Philosophy at all. They do, nevertheless, and are so fundamental, that we could have no Natural Theology without them. Like the axioms of Geometry, such principles are always assumed, and sometimes without being expressly stated, or suspected of being necessarily implied in all the reasoning upon the subject, even by those who place the most confidence in that kind of reasoning.

But Philosophy is equally implied and used in the reception of Revealed Theology. It is a question of Evidences. Now the same facts present themselves to each inquirers, but they satisfy the one and fail to satisfy the other. The difference is not in the facts or the arguments, but in the inquirers themselves, and in their Philosophy, that part of it which pertains to the nature and laws of evidence and proof. Mr. Hume, for

example, has settled it beforehand, for himself, that is, that Miracles are impossible; or if possible, cannot be proven; since the falsity of any amount or kind of testimony is less contrary to experience and all the rules and tests of evidence than the occurrence of any real Miracle. To such an one it is manifestly of no use to accumulate evidence in favor of Miracles; since he has settled it *in his Philosophy*, that evidence or testimony cannot, from its very nature, prove the proposition in question. Others, as Mr. Parker and the Pantheists hold, that what are called Miracles are not *specifically* different from other acts or events, and hence cannot prove any special interposition in the course and affairs of Nature—cannot prove a Revelation from God. Here, too, the question is purely a philosophical one. What are Miracles? What do they prove? Are special interposition and inspiration possible? These are questions of Philosophy, and must be met on the grounds of Philosophy, and they can be met and settled on no other.

And once more: In the interpretation of Scripture we find the same occasion for Philosophy. It comes in as our interpreter, (we cannot keep it out if we would,) it gives the form to our interpretation, and so to our Theology and doctrinal precepts. We take up the Scriptures and read, "There was in the days of Herod, the King of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias." We, perhaps, do not feel the need of any interpretation here. The declaration is plain enough without, and is to be taken literally. But when we take up the Scriptures again and read, "If any man cometh to me, and hateth not his father and his mother, he cannot be my disciple," we feel that this does need intrepretation—this cannot be taken literally. But why not? How do we know that it cannot? "Because," one may answer, "it can never be right nor a duty to hate one's father or mother." But how do we know that? It is a principle of Philosophy, one of those, indeed, in which *all* are agreed, and one which, therefore, is reckoned as a part of the common sense of mankind. But it is within the sphere of Philosophy, nevertheless.

Or again: If we find one writer declaring that we are justified by faith without works; and another, that we are justified

by works, we see that we cannot take both these declarations literally. But *why* not? It is true that they are contradictory. But who told us that of two contradictory propositions both cannot be true? This, too, is a part of Philosophy—a part we recognize and apply to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, whensoever we read them with any intention of finding out their true and proper meaning.

It is, indeed, true that these first principles of Philosophy—these primary axioms, constitute what we call *common sense.* And many persons, perhaps most persons, in using them have no idea that they are applying their Philosophy to the interpretation of the Scripture. Like the man, Monseiur Lowdain, in Moliere's Comedy, who had spoken prose all his life without knowing it, they have been *philosophizing*, and that, too, wisely and well, perhaps, without knowing it, and now when their attention has been called to it under that name, they, in the name of philosophy, condemn philosophy altogether.

But it may be said that, in this view of the case, we will use only that part of Philosophy which, from being received by all, and from being taught by the instincts of our common nature without recourse to books and learned treatises, has been called and regarded as common sense. And undoubtedly this is the safest and wisest course to be pursued, *as far as practicable.* But even this part of Philosophy is not always right. Galileo contradicted the plainest dictate of the common sense of his day, when he proclaimed the great doctrine which all men acknowledge to be true, with regard to the earth's revolution on its axis. No man can come more directly in conflict with "the common sense" of the day than our Lord in some of His declarations concerning Himself and the nature of His Kingdom.

This common sense, however, besides not being always right, does not go far enough to correct and solve all the questions that are presented, or arise in one's progress in the study of Theology. The Pantheist cannot be refuted by mere appeals to common sense, for he has already discarded its authority. Nor can he be convinced by the authority of Holy Scripture, for his question is previous to any recognition of such authority.

There is, then, we conceive, no escape from the issue. Philosophy we must have. False Philosophy prevails, and must be refuted. Wherever there is error, there is a fault in Philosophy to be corrected. Indeed, it is a saying of Sir William Hamilton's, which his disciples seem disposed to make a proverb, to the effect that "no difficulty emerges in Theology which had not previously emerged in Philosophy." But in saying what we do, we do not mean to affirm that no one can believe the Christian faith for all the purposes of salvation and sanctification, without studying Philosophy as such, or without perplexing himself with the more abstruse questions that so often bewilder those that engage in them: far from it. But we refer to a fact that even the more abstruse questions do interfere with the reception and interpretation of the faith. They make infidels of some, Pantheists of others, and these few influence multitudes of others who would never have thought of such questions, and never have made this an excuse or apology for their irreligion. And they that are set for the defense of the faith must defend it against those assaults also, and must meet their assailants with such weapons as will reach them.

In the preceding Articles already referred to, we have expressed our belief that Idealism, in any and all its forms, tends to Pantheism, or something which is, for all practical purposes, the same as Pantheism. We believe, also, that all forms and varieties of the system of Sensationalism tend to Atheism, or to something which is essentially and practically the same as Atheism. The development of Hume and the English Infidels of the last century we know of. Other developments we may yet have. When Locke's system, ascribing all our ideas in reference to their matter to sensation was generally received, it was shown that on the basis of that system all the objects of our ideas must be sensible and so material. That is, if there is a God He must be material; and hence, as some would adopt one and some the other horn of the dilemma thus presented, we have both materialists and atheists. Sir William Hamilton has made a modification of that theory of the origin of our ideas, for the purpose of avoiding this dilemma

altogether. What is to be the result? We think mainly this. That the idea of God is purely a creation of the fancy. His existence, therefore, is not implied in the idea of Him any more than the existence of any one of the heathen gods, in the various systems of Polytheism and Mythology, is implied in the fact that the people had *an idea of* such a being as they worshipped as their God.

We have spoken of Sir William Hamilton as being of the Sensational School. By turning to page 274 of his *Lectures*, we shall see the distinct avowal of this fact. He says that

"Our Perceptive or Acquisitive faculty is divided into two parts—the one directed to the non-Ego, called *External* Perception or Perception simply, and the other directed to the Ego—the phenomena of consciousness—and is called Self-Consciousness or *Internal* Perception. This Acquisitive faculty," he says, "is the faculty of Experience. External Perception is the faculty of external, self-consciousness is the faculty of internal experience. If we limit the term Reflection in conformity to its original employment and proper signification—an attention to the internal phenomena—*reflection* will be an expression for self-consciousness concentrated."

Here, then, we have Locke's theory of cognition, if not his theory of ideas, in almost his own precise terms. "All ideas are derived from Sensation and Reflection." How then are we to escape the materialism and atheism which have been deduced from Locke's principles? This skepticism applies to two objects—the external world, and the existence and notion of God.

With regard to the existence of an external world and its objects, *four* and possibly five theories have been proposed.

(1) The Platonic, which holds that ideas alone are substantial and permanent, and that external objects are only their shadows. It is represented by supposing a man standing in the mouth of a cave looking inwards, while the ideas outside of the cave cast their shadows into the cave by the beholder, and he sees these shadows beyond him, and mistakes them for real and substantial objects. This is the ideal theory of the world.

(2) We have the Sensational theory, which teaches that we

have and are conscious of certain sensations which are produced by the properties of external objects, and that on the ground of these sensations, and by means of them we perceive the objects. But Hume and the skeptics denied that these sensations necessarily imply any object out of ourselves; and assert that we have no right to believe in the existence of anything beyond or besides our sensations; that the mind itself is only a collective whole of these sensations.

(3) Fichte accepted this view as unanswerable. Our sensations and ideas are only modifications of ourselves; but by a trick of the fancy we project them into space, just as the object in a magic lantern is projected on to a screen, and we see it there, and thus persuade ourselves, that what are only the states and modifications of ourselves, our ideas and sensations, are external realities. Hegel adopted this view, and said we have three stages; (1) that in which we make no discrimination between those ideas and ourselves—do not think of self at all; (2) that in which we project them, as it were, into space, and believe them to be objectively real; and (3) that in which by reflection we discover this our mistake, and come to the knowledge of the fact that what we had supposed to be external objects, are but our own ideas and states.

(4) And Sir William Hamilton has proposed a fourth view. He would make the object perceived an object of consciousness, as well as the act of perceiving it.

"In the act of sensible perception I am conscious of two things: *of myself* as the *perceiving subject*, and of an *external reality* in relation with my sense, as the object perceived. Of the existence of both these things I am convinced; because I am conscious of knowing each of them, not mediately in something else, *as represented*, but immediately in itself, *as existing*."—Phil., p. 81. "The assertion that we can be conscious of an act of knowledge, without being conscious of its object, is virtually suicidal."—p. 173.

It is possible that to these we ought—in order to make our enumeration complete—to mention Berkeley's theory as an offspring of Locke's psychology. He believed external objects to have no substantial reality, but only a phenomenal one. Starting with the notion that we see, not the objects themselves, but only their properties, he doubted if we have any right

to believe that external objects are anything more than a collection of properties, whose very existence as such may depend upon the act of perception; and hence his theory is substantially the same as that of Fichte, though arrived at from a different starting point.

Of these theories we need not speak at present, at length. Plato's assumes a doctrine concerning the substantiality of ideas, which may be regarded as exploded. Locke's theory is doubtless the nearest right, but, assumed, as a part of its rationale, a theory of perception which has been exploded. Berkeley and Fichte alike assume the absurdity that a mere property, without a substantial basis, can be the object of cognition. We therefore proceed to consider Sir William Hamilton's theory, namely, that the object perceived is in consciousness.

But this is confounding the meaning of the word "consciousness." Nor can we give it so broad a meaning as is here attempted, without ignoring most important facts, and introducing an ambiguity of the most fatal character. We are conscious of the act of perceiving. We know that we perceive *immediately.* But not so with the object which we perceive. We see the object before us through the medium of light—by means of the eye and the optic nerve and the sensation produced in the sensory ganglia, any change in any one of which would change the idea we form of the object—its appearance to us—or might prevent our seeing it at all. These are facts that cannot be denied or overlooked without the greatest mischief. It is in these very facts, which Sir William would wink out of sight and cover up with a word, that the whole difficulty of the question resides. No one has ever doubted or denied a fact of consciousness proper, nor ever can. If I am conscious of seeing, I cannot doubt that I am conscious of the fact, nor the fact itself, as a fact of consciousness. But I may doubt about the cause of it, or the object of the act of perception. I hear a sound, for example, and may be in doubt at first, whether it is really the sound of some object around me, or merely *a ringing in my ears;* whether it is caused in fact by an act of sense and perception, or by some abnormal state of the organ of hearing. But that I hear the sound, or have a

sensation of sound, there never can be any doubt in any human mind—there never has been any.

Now see the effect of this theory in a specific application of it. Mr. Mansel, adopting this theory, deduces from it the conclusion that "an act of *creation* in the highest sense of the term—that is to say, an absolutely first link in the chain of phenomena, preceded by no temporal antecedent—is, to human thought, inconceivable," which he proves thus :—

"To represent in thought the first act of the First Cause of all things, I must conceive myself as placed, in imagination, at the point at which temporal succession commences, and as thus conscious of a relation between a phenomena in time, and a reality out of time. But the consciousness of such a relation implies a consciousness of both the related numbers; *to realize which the mind must be in and out of time at the same moment.*"—p. 99.

Of course this condition is impossible. But it will be seen that the whole argument is based on Sir William's theory of cognition and consciousness; namely, that in perceiving we are conscious of the object perceived, as well as of the act of perceiving, and consequently that the *object* also, as well as the act, must be in the *consciousness*, in the perceiving mind; or it must be where the object is "in time," and "out of time," if one is to have any conception of an act or event which passes from the one to the other. Hence, the idea of creation is impossible, not only—subjectively—impossible because of our inability to entertain it, but is in itself absurd and contradictory. And hence we have the legitimate and inevitable inference that no such act or event ever took place.

This theory of cognition is sadly objectionable on many grounds. Beside the objection against it, growing out of the above inference, we will mention one—and one only more—namely, that it is not much better than Fichte's subjective idealism. Fichte and Hegel make all objects to be but states and modes of ourselves; Sir William makes them to be facts or objects *within* ourselves, and in fact but little if anything else in reality than our ideas of them.*

* Thus Mansel says, p. 81: "But to conceive an object as non-existent is again a self-contradiction." Hence of course the eternity of matter and material

But this is not all. It follows necessarily from Sir William's theory of cognition, that all cognized objects are objects of consciousness, and so within the cognizing subject, that we can have no idea of an infinite, eternal Being, whom we may call God. Such a Being would make the finite mind to be comprehensive of the infinite—the limited container to embrace and hold within itself an infinite contained object. Hear Sir William's doctrine:

"The Unconditioned is incognisable and inconceivable, its notion being only negative of the conditioned, which last can alone be positively known or conceived. * * * * In our opinion the mind can conceive and consequently can know only the *limited and the unconditionally* limited. The unconditionally unlimited, or the *Infinite*, the unconditionally limited or the *Absolute*, cannot positively be construed to the mind; they can be conceived only by a thinking away from, or abstraction of, those very conditions under which thought itself is realized; consequently the notion of the Unconditioned is only negative—negative of the conceivable itself."—Phil., p. 454.

That is, the idea of God is either nothing—so that we have none—or it is a negative idea, by which of course the author means that the term "God" either denotes nothing, or is a negative term; since a negative idea is impossible. But if the term is negative, it denotes nothing, nor does it of necessity connote or imply any reality whatever. Such a term may be a pure creation of the fancy, as "*space*," &c., and neither denote nor imply any reality.

Nor is this mere inference. It is the gist and central point of Mr. Mansel's book. He aims to make us dependent and to make us *feel* our dependence on Holy Scripture for our knowledge of God and all divine truth, by shewing that the idea of

objects—both *a parte post* and *a parte ante*—they have always existed and can never be annihilated—their non-existence being absurd, and so impossible. But to our extract. "For that which is conceived exists as an object of thought in and by that conception. We may abstain from thinking of an object at all; but if we think of it, we cannot but think of it as existing." This need not be followed out. It speaks for itself. And yet it inevitably results from Sir William Hamilton's theory of cognition Thus while Fichte reduces all objects to mere subjective states—mere modes of the percipient being, Sir William gives objective reality to all the ideas and states of the percipient. And thus both alike, though in different ways, destroy the distinction between subjective and objective—between thought and substantial existence.

God does not belong to Philosophy at all. That God is "incognizable and inconceivable;" this *might* be done in either of three ways: (1) by showing that our faculties are inadequate to such an idea, (which, by the way, is what we fancy Sir William would have attempted, and *all* that he would have attempted;) (2) by showing that the methods used cannot lead to any such result, even though the result were attainable by other methods; and (3) by showing that the idea itself is contradictory, and in its very nature absurd. Now this last is what Mr. Mansel has attempted.

"There are," says Mr. Mansel, "three terms familiar as household words in the vocabulary of Philosophy, which must be taken into account in every system of Metaphysical Theology. To conceive of Deity as He is, we must conceive Him as First Cause, as Absolute, and as Infinite. By the *First Cause* is meant that which produces all things, and is itself produced of none. By the *Absolute* is meant that which exists in and by itself, having no necessary relation to any other Being. By the *Infinite* is meant that which is free from all possible limitation; that than which a greater is inconceivable, and which, consequently, can receive no additional attribute or mode of existence which it had not from all eternity. * * * But then these conceptions—the Cause, the Absolute, the Infinite, all equally indispensable—do they not imply contradiction to each other when viewed in conjunction as attributes of one and the same Being? * * * Thus we are landed in an inextricable dilemma. The Absolute cannot be conceived as conscious, neither can it be conceived as unconscious; it cannot be conceived as complex, neither can it be conceived as simple," &c. "The fundamental conception of Rational Theology being thus self-destructive, we may naturally expect to find the same antagonism manifested in their special applications. If an absolute and infinite consciousness" [conscious being] "is a conception which contradicts itself, we need not wonder if its several modifications naturally exclude each other. * * * The whole of this web of contradictions (and it might be extended, if necessary, to a far greater length) is woven from one original warp and woof; namely, the impossibility of conceiving the coëxistence of the Infinite and the finite, and the cognate impossibility of conceiving a first commencement of phenomena, or the Absolute giving birth to the Relative. * * * To sum up briefly this portion of the argument, the conception of the Absolute and Infinite, from whatever side we view it, appears encompassed with contradictions. There is a contradiction in supposing such an object to exist, whether alone or in conjunction with others; and there is a contradiction in supposing it not to exist," &c., &c, pp. 75—85.

We have quoted these extracts, not for the purpose of exhibiting Mr. Mansel's argument, but for the purpose of showing, beyond question or mistake, and in his own words, what is

precisely the proposition which he seeks to establish. It is that the conception of an Infinite, Absolute Being, who is First Cause and Creator, is impossible, because the idea or conception itself is absurd and self-contradictory.

Now suppose him to have been successful, what then? Are we to believe that there is such a Being on the grounds of testimony, because the Bible says so? Ask the tyro in Geometry if, after he has demonstrated that there can be no space enclosed by two straight lines, because the idea is absurd and self-contradictory, he is prepared to believe that there is such a thing nevertheless, on *any* testimony? Are not absurdities and self-contradictions *in thought*, impossible *in reality and existence?* If not, what becomes of demonstration, and of mathematics in general? They prove nothing—are a mere delusion.

It would thus seem that Mr. Mansel has made an argument for *Atheism*, which no skill can refute, and no ingenuity evade, without a denial of his premises. But those premises are the fundamental principles of Sir William Hamilton's system of Metaphysics. Hence we infer that *his* system is as inevitably atheistic in its tendency as the preceding forms of Sensationalism have been. And this, Mr. Mansel, most likely without intending it, has shown as fully as Hume did the like tendency of Mr. Locke's system.

We think that we have said enough already, irrespective of any such *reductio ad absurdum*, to show that *one* of Sir William's fundamental principles is wrong—namely, that which teaches that the *object* of perception or cognition is matter of, and so in the consciousness as well as the act of cognition. A second of his fundamental principles is as easily refuted.

In order to show that the idea of the Infinite and Absolute Creator is impossible, he attempts to prove that the very process of forming the idea brings its object into relations and limitations. But he makes the mistake of confounding what the logicians would call the *logical* quantity of an idea with the *continuous* quantity of its object. He assumes that because the object is infinite, therefore the idea of it is infinite. The idea, being in a finite mind, cannot be infinite, and therefore its object cannot be either infinite or absolute. An idea is in-

deed necessarily limited in logical quantity, whether in a fini or an infinite mind. It is made up of *Essentia* and *Differenti* The Differentia are relative and limitative in their very natur and hence limit the idea by its co-ordinate. In every gen there are two species at least, and each species limits tl other—that is, in logical quantity. Mind and matter limit ea other in logical quantity, simply because they are unlike, ar the one is not the other. Two material objects limit ea other for the same reason—in logical quantity. But becau they *are material*, they limit each other in continuous quanti also. Neither *of them* can be infinite, since the one exclud and limits the reality of the other. But mind and matt limit each other in no such way; they can both occupy tl same space at the same time. God can be in and fill all thing and yet His presence will in no way preclude the existence other minds, or of material objects. The *idea* of an infini object need not be itself infinite. In fact it cannot be infinit since no idea is or can be infinite in itself. It has a co-ord nate, and is limited by it.*

Before we proceed to another error which is fundamental Sir William's philosophy, and so vitiates Mr. Mansel's re soning also, we will consider one or two other points, more in mediately connected with his main subject.

The idea of God on their theory is a pure creation of tl fancy, as much so as that of a centaur or hippogriff, or tl idea of Brahma, of Osiris, or Jupiter. His existence, we w suppose, *may* be proved if we can have the means of pro But the idea of Him is no proof of His existence. Nay, so f from it, it is "negative," "absurd," and "self-contradictory

But how shall the existence of God be proved? Man festly, there are but two ways: either (1) by direct cognitio

* Strictly speaking, the term "infinite" does not belong to either logical discreet—that is, numerical quantity; it belongs exclusively to continuous qu tity, and measures the extent of the reality of existing substantial objects a their properties. To talk of the infinity of an idea, therefore, is as absurd as talk of its density or its temperature. And this confusion, a metabasis from c kind of quantity to another, underlies and constitutes one of the fundamen fallacies in all the forms of Idealism and Pantheism.

or (2) by testimony. But testimony *in this case* comes to be what we call Revelation. We must have had at first either a person or a book as a witness. But the book must have been written by men, and hence Revelation comes to be the testimony of the men, who were its authors. Now as Mr. Mansel and Sir William Hamilton deny that we have any direct cognition or insight of God's existence, it follows that they can hold only to the second alternative, and teach that we must prove God's existence by testimony, and by Revelation. And this is not only *our inference* from their principles; it is the avowed object and design of these authors. "The Limits of Religious Thought" was written to enforce this very doctrine. Let us then consider it.

Now we say that without the idea of God, and some proof of His existence, no Revelation from Him can be proved. The proof *of His existence* must precede any proof of *a Revelation from Him.*

First, then, in general and *a priori*, nothing is more certain than that no process of reasoning or means of proof can furnish the terms of the conclusion. We take up the Bible. It claims to be a Revelation from God. To put this proposition in form, we may say, "This Book is a Revelation from God," or "God has spoken in this Book," and sent it to us. Hence the term "God" must appear as either subject or part of the predicate. It is really and virtually the subject of the proposition. Hence we come to our proposition, that no method or means of proof can furnish either of the terms of the conclusion. We must know that God *is*, before it can be proved that He has *made* a Revelation, or *done* anything; and we must know *what* a Revelation is, before we can be convinced that a Revelation has been made.

This we regard as conclusive and final. And we are sure it will be satisfactory without another word to all who are familiar with the technicalities of Logic. But for others we will add a few illustrations of a less technical character. Let us suppose that one receives a letter from a person whose existence is unknown to him, and who describes himself as Mr. A. B. Now the letter is doubtless *an effect*, and as such must

have had a cause ; it must have been written by somebody. But it is of itself no proof whatever that there is such a person as A. B. The letter may have been written by any one of ten thousand persons whom we know to be in existence. The letter may indeed show something of the character of its author ; but it does not establish his identity or individuality. If the messenger who brings the letter assures us of the existence of A. B., then we are prepared for the proof that he is the author of the letter. But we must know of his existence, by testimony outside of the letter, before it can be proved that he wrote it. We must know that he is in existence, before we can know any of his acts. But the person who assures us that Mr. A. B. exists, or that there is such a person, must have either seen him himself, or derived his knowledge from some one who had seen him, so that at last we come to an act of personal cognition as the basis of our knowledge of his existence, and of all existence.

Now, suppose the author of a book of Holy Scripture, Moses, for example, assures us that he has seen God ; that is satisfactory; but his seeing is not to him revelation, as his testimony is to us. It is actual perception or cognition, in his case ; and so God has been cognized, which is contrary to Sir William Hamilton's theory—the theory which we have already said Mr. Mansel adopts.

But, again, suppose a miracle; if we see God working it, we cognize Him in the act; if not, we only know that it is the work of some one that can work miracles. Or, if we should say that the books of Holy Scripture are of such a character that they could not have been written by uninspired men, we admit the assertion, and it proves that the authors of those books were inspired by some one capable of inspiring them. But we are entirely too far removed from the Infinite Himself to be able to say how many of His creatures inferior to Himself can do such things. Nay, without knowing that there is such a Being beforehand, we should, of course, never be able to ascribe the miracle or inspiration to any other being or cause than that which with our bodily eyes we see in the most immediate connection with it. We should only regard the miracle

worker and the teacher of the extraordinary dogmas as a most extraordinary and unaccountable man.

We do not, however, care to urge this point; we are satisfied of its soundness, and also of the fact that all others will be satisfied with it whenever they come to fully comprehend it.

We do not, then, agree with Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mansel in fixing the "limits of religious thought" this side of or below the idea of God, so as to make Him "incognizable" and "inconceivable." And we think we have shown that if this were so, no revelation from Him could either be made or authenticated, and, of course, Scripture itself could not prove this existence, and so would become worthless for all purposes of religion and theology. Unless we have, some how or other, the idea of God antecedent to any such revelation, and so independent of it, our case is hopeless.*

On the contrary, we are happy to be able to coincide with Mr. Mansel in the following declarations:

"The very consciousness of our own limitations of thought bears witness to the existence of the Unlimited, * * * the shadow of the Infinite still broods over the consciousness of the finite; and we wake up at last from the dream of absolute wisdom to confess 'Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not.'"—p. 128.

"With the first development of consciousness, there grows up, as a part of it, the innate feeling that our life, natural and spiritual, is not in our power to sustain or prolong; that there is One above us on whom we are dependent; whose existence we know, and whose presence we realize by the sure instinct of prayer. We have thus, in the sense of dependence, the foundation of one great element of religion—the fear of God."—p. 120.

It is true that Mr. Mansel calls this an "innate *feeling*," and says that God is "*beyond thought.*" These expressions

* We might, were it not for taking up too much room, show from the Scriptures themselves that they *presuppose* an idea of God and a belief in His existence. We refer, however, only to Rom. i: 19, 20; "the invisible things of Him, *from the creation of the world*, are clearly seen," &c. Even if we take "from" to denote the time when the knowledge commenced, yet the argument is the same—that God is manifest in and by His works—the invisible seen in and through the visible. The other text to which we will refer, is Heb. ii: 6; "for he that cometh to God must believe that He is"—here a belief in His existence and moral government, are evidently assumed as belonging to Natural Theology, and so existing prior to and as a ground or condition precedent to a revelation. Nature teaches *that* God is. Revelation teaches *what* He is.

we shall not try to reconcile with the statements in the midst of which they occur. There are a good many little points in these quotations which we have neither time nor inclination now to discuss. These quotations present precisely Mr. Mansel's theory, and contain in germ all that he has said or could say in the development and defence of his theory; they base the knowledge of God, not on insight or intelligence, but on feeling. They inculcate the theory that the feeling is first, the idea of God is afterwards. And if so, the idea is a mere creation of the fancy, and is no proof whatever of the existence of God, any more than "the bare imagination of a feast" is proof that there is a dinner already provided, and within the reach of a hungry man.

And this brings us, after this long preface, to what we regard as the real point and aim of our article, to account for the origin of the idea of God, and to show that that idea is proof absolute of His existence.

Of the origin of ideas there have been three theories.

But first let us say that an idea is something in the mind which represents an object; and by the elements of the idea which each one of them, separately and individually, represents a property of the object. Thus one sees an object before him, and in the process of seeing it he forms an idea of it. His idea of it represents it to his mind in memory, in reasoning, &c., by its properties. If the object be white, then the idea has an element in it which represents to his spiritual being that whiteness. It may be wholly unlike it, the element of the idea wholly unlike the property of the object, and yet it represents it, and is the means, in part, by which the idea represents its object, and becomes *its* idea, or the idea *of* it.

(1.) Now, in the first place, Plato holds that these ideas are *substantive* objects, and are put into the mind by God himself, as collective wholes already formed, as one might pour pebbles from one hand to the other. This is Platonic Idealism. But it assumes that ideas are substantial, eternal, divine—the substance of God.

(2.) From the time of Leibnitz we have a post-Leibnitzian Idealism which holds that these ideas are not put into the mind

by its Creator *as wholes and already formed*, but in their parts and elements, so that whenever we see any object, the sight or senses furnish a part of the elements, and the mind itself from its innate store furnishes the rest; this is Kant's theory. One or the other of these theories all Idealists adopt, and all Mystics and Sentimentalists agree with them, and must of necessity agree with them on this point.

(3.) But, thirdly, as early as Carneades there was another theory advanced, a theory which is in its essential features the theory of all Sensationalists, including Mr. Locke, namely, that on seeing an object something passes into the sensorium and there forms the idea of that object, and that in perceiving the object, *as we suppose*, we perceive only the idea of it which was thus formed—or without going into details, the advocates of this theory hold that all ideas are formed in the mind and are products of its activity. But they also hold that all the elements of our ideas are derived from or through sensation, except of course our ideas of our own mental activity.

The two first theories named are for most purposes substantially the same, and lead to Pantheism; the other leads to Materialism and Atheism.

Now we propose to call attention to some facts in psychology which all these theories have overlooked.

(1.) We agree with the Sensationalists in holding that all ideas are formed *in* the mind and are products of its activity. But we hold, as they do not, to an insight which furnishes elements of ideas totally different from any that are furnished by the senses—sight, touch, taste, hearing, &c. These elements enter into all our ideas, and are of two kinds—(1) first, properties of sensible objects not cognizable by the senses; and (2) properties, and so the existence, of *objects* themselves which are not perceptible by the senses. And in this connection we refer to Dr. Winslow's work, named at the head of our article, as being in the main right as we believe, and as containing in his chapter on "Intuition," p. 174, et. seq. the germ of the whole matter.

Thus we manifestly have a sight and an insight—a sight for what is visible, and an insight for thein visible that lies beyond,

—a sight for the seen realities of time and place, and an insight for the unseen that lies beyond and beneath what we see, as its ground and explanation. For example, we see before us a piece of rock and a flowering plant. We know at once that the arrangement of its particles in the one, has been made by a different force and acting from an idea different from what we see in the other; this is a matter of insight. Again, we enter our room after a short absence, and find that during that absence the furniture has been arranged and the room put in order. We know that this was done by some intelligent being, and not by the furniture itself. We see also in the nature of the arrangement, that it was made with a careful and benevolent regard to our wishes. But this too is insight—all insight. And by the same sort of insight do we see, and with the same undoubting and absolute conviction of certainty do we see, by insight also, the moment we look anywise minutely or carefully into the objects of the material world around us, that they did not arrange themselves, but that they were arranged by some Intelligent and Benevolent Creator, who by His Intelligence, Power and Benevolence deserves our adoration, gratitude and service.

We have not room however, nor would this be the place to discuss the influence of this fact on the theory of the origin of ideas, at length. We only state it for the purpose of showing its relations to a most important question of theology, natural and revealed. This insight does not of course give us any one idea of any visible or material object; the elements of such ideas must come through the senses. But it gives us additionl elements—those additional elements which make all the difference between our ideas and the ideas which animals form of the same objects, (if indeed they form any ideas,) and constitute all the difference between our intelligence and that of the brute creation. It enables us, while they only see things, to *see into*, understand and comprehend them. Hence we have sciences—they have none. We know of causes and laws, a Creator; they have no idea of such things.

(2.) Thus while we affirm as against the Sensationalists that there is a source of the elements of ideas besides and different

from the senses and sensation, whereby we come to have knowledge of objects, properties and relations, which otherwise we should know nothing of, we would call attention also to the other fact that there are no innate ideas or elements of ideas—no ideas or elements of ideas in the mind, furnished by the mind or produced by it, except on the condition of a cognition of some object by the property which that element represents. Thus, if one is blind he has no idea of color—no idea how objects *look*—the element of ideas which represents the color of objects is not in his mind, forms no part of his ideas, does not enter into his thoughts. So it is, if one is deaf, with the elements that represent sound—or with that which represents odors if one cannot smell. No efforts, of the will, no description, nothing that we can do, will enable the blind to imagine how objects look—what we mean by their color. The difference between white and black, red and blue, is inconceivable to them. Nor, to carry our illustration one step farther, can even those who can see *imagine* a new color. It is possible that one who had seen a white object and a black one might imagine one that is gray, the mixture of white and black—but if we had never seen a red object, for example, we could not imagine one that is red.

This same inability to originate elements of ideas, extends to the insight also. If, for example, we take up a book and make certain articulate sounds indicated by the printed or written characters, we are understood, and said to read. But if one jabbers on, regardless of sense, he is said to jabber only—the difference is a matter not of hearing but of insight. No animal that may chance to hear us knows the difference. So with a child who has not yet learned to read—he will take his book and jabber away, and we cannot persuade him or make him understand that he is not reading. But the moment he gets an insight of reading, and knows what it is, he can understand what jabbering is, and distinguish between them.

Now from these *facts* concerning the origin of ideas, we derive two most important results.

(1.) By recognizing a source of the elements of ideas besides and different from the senses, we get a basis for our belief in

absolute truths and immaterial objects, both of which are matters of intuition. We know by insight that two and two are four—that every effect has had a cause, &c. It results from the very nature of the subject matter of these propositions, that they are true—a nature which we see and know only by insight.

(2.) By denying, as against the Idealists, that any idea or element of an idea can come into the mind except on condition of a cognition of some object by that property. We find a ground for absolute certainty for the existence of objects out of ourselves, and of an object for each property that we have any idea of, or can predicate of any object whatever. Thus if we have an idea of *white* paper, the idea does not indeed imply that we have actually seen any *paper* that is white; but it does absolutely prove that we have seen some object that is white. Otherwise we should have no such element of ideas, any more than the blind have the element of color, or the deaf of sound, &c. These elements are acquired indeed in the act of cognition, and not otherwise—but after they have been acquired they can be retained and used in new and ever varied combinations, or in the wild creations of the fancy, or as ideals of the imagination.

If now we have an idea or conception of God, and if we ascribe to Him any attribute that is not ascribed to any other object of thought, then we must have an insight of Him—a direct cognition of Him as an existing substantial reality, and the existence of the idea of God in the minds of any is proof of His existence, as certainly as the idea of colored objects in the mind proves the existence of such objects around us which we have seen, and by seeing which we have derived our ideas of color.

Now, beyond question, we ascribe to God attributes which we ascribe to no other object of thought; attributes which differ, not in degree only, but in kind, also; else He would not be God—the One only. He would be only one of a class; one individual in a species of the same kind of beings. We say He is infinite, eternal, omnipresent, &c., and by these attributes we mean something which admits of no degrees. We beg to refer again to our article on Theodore Parker, April 1859, p.

33, and to the remarks on the meaning of the word "infinite" there given; the same, *mutatis mutandis*, is to be said of "eternal" and "omnipresent." Eternal, is not merely a long time, it is out of time; without succession, beginning, progress or end. So with omnipresence. It is not mere prolonged extension from one place or point to another, but it is presence without extension.

Nor can these properties or attributes be resolved into any mere sensible properties. For example; the moment we attempt to make "infinite" to be infinitely long, we make a most fatal *metabasis;* the thing becomes entirely different, absurd, and contradictory; implying, as we said in the article referred to, not the existence, but non-existence of its object. So with eternal; what is in time is not eternal: what has succession, whether short or long, cannot attain unto eternal duration. Omnipresence which resolves itself into extended presence, becomes absurd. We know at once that there can be no such object in existence; the very supposition involves a contradiction in terms.*

With regard to the existence of God, philosophically considered, there are, as Sir William says, four possible theories. The first which he gives as his own, and which we have already quoted, namely, that "God is incognizable and inconceivable—the term being only negative of the finite, limited, &c. (2.) He is not an object of knowledge at all: but the *idea of* God is a regulative principle in the mind, influencing and con-

* And this is, in part, a fault that underlies all Mr. Mansel's reasoning, in regard to the idea of God. With him, infinite is only a composition of finite parts; the absolute, is that which is out of, and so has no, relations; and therefore, not only inconceivable, but impossible—and not that which is self-existent, and so dependent upon nothing; subject to no law or necessity above Himself. God does not cease to be absolute by becoming a Creator, in any proper sense of the word; and yet, in Mr. Mansel's sense of it, He does cease to be absolute the moment He ceases to be the only existing reality. Drop from the words Infinite, Absolute, &c. their improper meanings, the meanings derived from Sensationalism, and adopt the proper meaning, and that, too, the only proper meaning of them, and so far from denoting absurdities and contradictions in terms, they denote a reality, whose existence is necessary, and whose non-existence cannot even be supposed, except as we may suppose any other absurdity—a space enclosed by two straight lines, for example.

trolling its activity; this opinion he ascribes, and truly, t Kant. (3.) That of Schelling, namely, that God is cogniza ble, (we can know Him,) but not conceivable—so that, thoug we may know Him, we can form no definite conception of Him His existence, character and attributes; and (4.) which he as cribes to Cousin, namely, that God is cognizable and conceiv able, the idea of Him being formed under the same conditions and as all others are, by Essentia and Differentia." Phil. p. 454. We have, in these statements, departed from Sir William's phraseology, which is not always the most intelligible, i order to translate his thoughts, as far as possible, into common language. Even then, the difference between these fou views could not be explained fully, without a good deal of discussion and explanation. But the view which we have take coincides more nearly with that here ascribed to Cousin, tha with either of the others. But, we differ totally from Cousin's theory of the origin of the idea. His theory of the origin of ideas—that is, of the ideas of objects not cognizable by the external senses at least, is essentially Platonic. So he regards it, and expressly declares himself. But, we hold that God is cognized by the insight of Reason, as directly as the mind itself, and that the conception of Him is formed in the same way as all other conceptions—the conception of the mind, or of the soul, for example, although more slowly, and with greater difficulty.

Let us look for a moment into the psychology of this process. When we look at any visible object near us, we form at once (and by a function of the imagination, as we think,) an idea-image of the object, representing it exactly as it appears to the senses. When we see the object again, again the imagination or fancy performs the same function, and we have another idea-image of the object, representing it exactly as it appears on this second occasion of cognition; and so on for each occasion of cognition. But from these several idea-images we abstract, guided by insight, what we regard as purely accidental, and by no means essential to the integrity and identity of the object; and what remains after the abstraction of these accidental elements of the several idea-images, remains as our *conception* of

the object. This conception we cannot picture to the imagination or fancy. It does not represent the object as it *appears*, or as it *appeared* on any one occasion of cognition, but simply and only by those properties which are essential to it, and common to all the idea-images which we may have formed, or can form.

But in the cognition by insight alone, as in the cognition of the soul, the facts of consciousness and of God, no such idea-image can be formed, for the obvious reason that these objects are not cognized by the external senses, and therefore give none of those elements of ideas, out of which the imagination and fancy construct their idea-images. And this, we suppose, is all that is really true, and perhaps all that was really intended by Sir William Hamilton, Mansel, and others, when they speak of God as being "incognizable" and "inconceivable." They mean that we can form no idea-image of Him; cannot *imagine* or conceive *how he looks*. But, most assuredly, reality is not limited by the functions of sense-perception and the imagination; there are realities which no eye can see or hands handle. Of such we can form no idea-image; but we form conceptions of them.

In thus speaking of God as being an object of direct cognition, we wish to qualify our assertion, and guard it against objection and misapprehension by other considerations, before proceeding any farther.

(1.) In the first place, we must be on our guard against supposing that if the view now presented is true, we should have had the idea of God, *as His character and attributes are now understood by us, or are revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures*, among our earliest conceptions. The idea which we now entertain of God has been greatly modified by the traditional knowledge of Him which we have received from our parents and teachers at first, and from our study of Nature and the Holy Scriptures afterwards. So, also, in heathen lands, this primary cognition has been modified by their received systems of Polytheism and idolatry, until nearly all lineaments of it are lost. All that we claim, therefore, is, that there was such a primary cognition, as the basis of all subsequent knowledge

and modifications; and that, without such a primary cognition, there could have been no such educational influence exerted on the expanding mind, as it passed from infancy through childhood and youth, to the maturity of manhood.

(2.) We must not expect from every such cognition, any *definite idea* or *adequate* knowledge of God, of any kind, in early youth; the senses are quick in their activity. So, also, is the insight in some of its functions; but in others, it is, if not slow, yet at least tardy in arriving at its results. Take, for example, the case of a triangle; the moment the child sees one object of a triangular shape, he forms his idea-image of the object *as triangular*. But the abstract idea of a triangle, he forms only after some years, and even then he may need to study some months, at least, before he will understand all the geometry and trigonometry of the triangle. And yet, all of geometry and trigonometry were implied in, and finally developed from, that first idea-image of a triangular body, while the idea of a triangle, as such, and as an object of conscious thought, was not even yet in the child's mind. In the same way an idea-image, formed at the first sight of a cone, contains all the elements of conic sections. And yet, it takes years of study, with the help of books and masters, to develope that idea into a knowledge of all the properties and functions of the conic sections. We believe they are not all known yet, even by the most advanced of our mathematicians. How much more, then, must the work of developing the first cognition and dawning idea of God into a full and complete knowledge of His Being and attributes, be the work of time! Not an object we see in Nature, not a fact in the operations of our own minds, not an event in history, not an act of mercy or Christianity which we ever experience, but illustrates to us something farther of His character and dealings with men.

(3.) And finally, it is not unlikely that there is an obscurity of the insight, like the effect of a film over the natural eye. We may suppose a child born, not absolutely blind, but so blinded as we often see adults, by a film over the eye; they can distinguish between day and night; they can even see when objects are moving before them. But they can distin-

guish no colors or definiteness of outline; can recognize no one object by its sight; they can see that there are objects around them, but not *what* they are. Now, in this case, in reference to the external world, we should have two effects. (1.) Even this sight would be as absolute and final as a proof of the existence of an external world, as the most perfect vision which any of the most sharp-sighted men possess. (2.) The objects thus seen, would excite emotions, and thus influence our activity no less really, though perhaps not to the same extent, and certainly not in the same way, as they now do. In our partly blind man, fear and pain would undoubtedly predominate over hope and pleasure. But still the emotions would be as real, and as indispensable to any attempt to account for his actions, as though he could see and rightly understand the objects around him, and their relations to him.

Some theologians insist that there is such an obscureness, perhaps the consequences of the fall and of sin, over the insight of all men; this insight, as we see it, is of slow activity, is often mistaken, sees into things but tardily, often with great difficulty, and discriminates them truly only after long study, and much concentration of the gaze upon the object of study. How few see into and comprehend the nature of even the physical forces—heat, light and electricity. How few see into and comprehend the nature and activity of the soul. How imperfect and inadequate everywhere is the knowledge of God. But yet we believe that the idea we have of Him, by the natural use of our faculties, proves His existence as fully and as absolutely as the imperfect knowledge of the partly blind man, whose case we have just considered, proves for him, that there is a world of objects around him of which, however, he knows so little, and that little so imperfectly. And this imperfect vision and the inadequate idea derived from it is, as we believe, the basis and the condition which renders them possible of all the religions of the world, and of all our religious culture. Nay, it is, in our estimation, that which renders any proof of the authenticity and genuineness of a revelation, as the means of farther and fuller knowledge of God, possible. It accounts for

the religious fears which even the professed unbelievers and atheists always manifest.

If our view of the origin of the idea of God be not correct, then that idea is purely a creation of fancy, as much so as the ideals of the artist, the conceptions of the poet, or the characters and attributes of the fabulous beings whom the heathen worship as gods. But in that case we should have two manifest results.

(1.) The idea would not contain any element, or ascribe to God any attribute which had not been furnished to the mind in the cognizance of a real object; this is, as a matter of fact, the law and condition under which the mind always acts in forming its *a priori* ideas. It combines and arranges anew the elements obtained in previous cognition. But it can go no farther; the ideas of the blind have no element that represent color. Nor can even those that see *imagine* any new primary color. Strictly, absolutely, and inexorably are we all bound in the acts of imagination and fancy to the elements previously given in cognition. Not even in the wildest freaks of hallucination, or the delirium of insanity, do we, or can we ever originate a single new element of an idea, except in the act of cognizing some object by that property. Hence, if our ideas of God were not derived from cognition of Him, it could not represent Him by any property which is peculiar to Himself, nor by any attribute which is incommunicable. It could not represent God; it could represent, at best, only a perfected man —humanity idealized.

(2.) But, in the second place, an idea of God made up in this way would exert no such influence upon the heart as we see that this idea has everywhere exerted upon the heart of man. Poets, and persons of poetic temperament, are sometimes led away and bewildered by a sense of the reality of the creations of their own imaginations. But this idiosyncrasy is of a limited nature, and confined, for the most part, to themselves, or at least to the very narrow circle around them; that which *all* see, or feel, however imperfectly, yet if it is seen and felt by *all*, is regarded by all as real, is an object of fear or hope—of love or hate to all persons. Were there no such insight of the existence of God as we have described, the idea which most

persons form of Him would have been derived from others, and received with a sense of unreality, like that which now accompanies our ideas of Jupiter, Saturn, &c., and which we know did actually accompany the faith, such as it was, which the ancient heathen nations had in their gods: that faith took no hold of their hearts; it was entirely rejected by the most intelligent among them.

There is one point more in our general subject which we propose to consider, and the discussion of which will tend, as we believe, both to throw light upon and to confirm the views we have already taken.

We think we have shown thus far, taking this article together with the preceding articles on Theodore Parker—(1) that with the Sensational theory of the origin and nature of ideas, we can have no idea of God, properly so considered, at all—but that the only logical consequent of such principles will always be, as the historical development has always sooner or later been, materialism or atheism—a materialistic atheism or an atheistic materialism; and (2) that with the idealistic theory of the origin of ideas, whether we take the Platonic ante-Leibnitzian or the Kantian post-Leibnitzian form of the theory, the idea of God in the mind is no proof of His existence—and that that theory will always tend to some form of rationalistic infidelity or infidel rationalism, and to a Pantheistic monism, as in fact it always has done, and, as it seems to be indicated by the logical deductions from the first principles of the system, it always must do.

But we have a third view to consider. It is held by some—the Mystics or Sentimentalists especially—that there is in man a religious instinct, a sense of want, which prompts man to seek for something to worship, as hunger prompts him to seek for food. We have quoted Mansel—Sensationalist as he is in his general system and affinities—as expressing precisely this view—"an innate feeling" for what he however says "is beyond thought," to Whom we are led "by the sure instinct of prayer." Mr. Maurice's book is full of this theory, and is but a development and assertion of it as against and in answer to Mr. Mansel's main theory.

Now to state this precisely—we have two facts, an *idea* God, which pertains to the intellect, and a *feeling* of Go which pertains to the sensibility. The two are relative, t one to the other, undoubtedly—but which is first and antec dent, and which is latter and consequent? Idealists, as suc should say that the idea is first, and produces the feeling emotion. Sentimentalists or Mystics say that the feeling instinct is first, and the idea afterwards—and many who a really Idealists in their general relations, come to be Sentime talists in this part of their philosophy, and even, as we ha seen, the Sensational Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mans are Sentimentalists in this. They think that such a hypothes is necessary to account for the fact that the idea of God—a idea which on their theory is a mere creation of the fancy, negative idea [term] which does not of itself denote or imp any corresponding belief—(the only corresponding object of negative term is—nothing)—has retained such a hold up man, and continues to exert so much influence upon his feelin and conduct. Doubtless they are right in this; something the kind is necessary to account for the continuance and infl ence of the idea of God—to account in fact for the continu belief in and fear of Him—if the idea of Him has no other better foundation than their theories will allow them to ascri to it.

But let us look at the theory. We divide all the facts mental activity into three classes—Intelligence, Sensibility an Will. With the two former only are we now concerned. W speak of any product of the mental activity as an *idea*: w speak of any active state of the sensibility as either a sens tion or an emotion—a sensation if it leads to or contribut any element towards the formation of an idea—but an emotio if it leads or tends to an act of the will or of the body. A emotion then may belong to any class of feelings as the acti state of that feeling. Thus we may have emotions of hung —emotions of love, of hate, of hope, or of fear—emotions beauty or of disgust—emotions of remorse or of self-approb tion—emotions of piety or of profanity and irreverence. No there is this important distinction of emotions into two class

—the one of which does and the other does not imply an intellectual antecedent. For example, hunger implies no intellectual antecedent. It grows out of the state of the body. One might be hungry, without a mind, without a brain. The *idea* of food does not necessarily precede and create the appetite for it; appetite comes constitutionally and from the physical constitution. But not so with fear, for example. We see an object and it excites fear; the emotions of beauty and sublimity arise only on the sight or thought of something beautiful and sublime. Remorse comes only when we are conscious of having done wrong. Hence the affections, desires, moral and æsthetic emotions, all imply an intellectual antecedent. An idea which may be formed at the moment, and on sense-perception of an object, or by the imagination, may be recalled by the memory or produced as in the case of the moral emotions by an act of the judgment, declaring an act to be right or wrong.

Now to which of these two classes of emotions do the religious or theistic emotions belong? The Sentimentalists say, or at least assume, and the exigencies of their theory require, that they should be considered as belonging to the class which requires no intellectual antecedent. They regard them as emotions or instincts which lead to and occasion the idea of God, and so a belief in His existence. On the other hand, we hold that the idea of God, even in the obscurity and vagueness which results from the present state of our fallen nature, precedes and is the intellectual antecedent of our religious or theistic emotions. We see God, and *therefore* we fear; we adore Him, and we abhor ourselves.

Let us consider the theory which holds that the emotions precede and determine the idea. In that case the theistic emotions are analogous to the appetites, and arise as instincts out of our very constitution, with no act of cognition, no idea preceding, furnishing an object out of ourselves to awaken the emotions.

Now in the first place, such emotions never lead to or enable us to form any idea of their object. Suppose that one could live without eating—had grown up from childhood without

taking food, and with the gnawings of hunger always distressing him. He would have no idea of what ailed him, and not the remotest conjecture of what he wanted; no conception of the object that would relieve him. But give him an article of food, let him eat, and by eating appease his hunger, and the next time the hunger returned upon him, it would be not only *an* appetite, not only hunger, but an appetite and a hunger *for* the article which had once satisfied him, and by satisfying his painful emotions had become associated in his mind with them. We need not, however, suppose a case. We may take almost any case of disease—of unrest arising from any abnormal condition or want of the system. Take, if you please, the very common case of acidity of the stomach, or heartburn, and a small quantity of alkali will satisfy the want and remove the pain as readily as food satisfies hunger. The cases are perfectly analagous for all our present purposes. But the disease never suggests of itself the remedy. It never prompts or enables the mind to form any idea of what will cure it. Take the alkali, and relief ensues, and the next time that the same symptoms return, there will most likely be a hankering after what had before afforded relief. In this way it is that we acquire tastes in after life for what in infancy we had no relish. And even in disease we acquire an appetite for nauseous drugs and deadly poisons. But the painful emotions do not pass over into ideas of what will satisfy them—do not stimulate or guide the mind in forming them, without direct cognition of the object. We might live in pain and die without knowing either what ailed us, or what would have relieved us if we had but known it, for all the mere constitutional emotions could do.

It is indeed true that the smell or taste of an object will sometimes produce the feeling that it will satisfy one want, even before we have experienced the satisfaction which it can afford. But in this case the object is cognized by the sense of taste and smell—before such opinion or idea of its adaptation to our wants is formed or entertained. And we add further, that emotions never contribute any element towards the formation of ideas. Not emotions but sensations contribute and conditionate these elements, and sensations are always produced by

the object which we cognize by the sensations. Hence, even in this case, the object is before the idea, and its cognition is the condition of the formation of any idea of it.

We conclude, therefore, that the theistic emotions, if they were first in the order, and did not imply any intellectual antecedent, as the Sentimentalists hold, could never lead one to form the idea of God, or guide him in the formation of it. But that on the contrary he would need, none the less on account of this antecedent emotion, a cognition or insight of God as an existing Reality, before he could connect the idea of God with the feelings or emotions, and make them flow out into piety, fear, hope, reverence, and the like.

But it may be asked if it would not be sufficient if the idea of God had once been communicated to man, and perpetuated by oral tradition or written revelation. In that case, the idea would become associated with these feelings—the feelings drawn out by the idea, and cultivated by a constant worship and adoration. But to this we answer, no. All the analogies and all the experience is the other way. Without the experience of eating, and the relief which it affords, no description of an object of food by others could connect that object with an appetite so as to make a hunger for that object. The psychological fact to which we refer—namely, peculiar personal tastes or appetites, as those for food, for ardent spirits, for opium, for other nauseous drugs or deadly poisons—never come from mere description or efforts of the imagination. Nothing short of actual experience (and experience implies the cognition of the object cognized, by some of the senses at least, if not by all of them) establishes that living rigorous connection between the emotion and the object that satisfies it, which constitutes what we call special appetites—the irresistible power of temptation to the drunkard and the debauchee. The idea of God thus presented might lead us to suppose that He is the object that our souls long for, and to desire on that account a knowledge of Him. But nothing short of an actual cognition or *experience* of Him could satisfy the feeling, or ever perpetuate the belief that He is indeed what we are longing for. In our religious experience, in our hopes and joys, no less than in our

fears, *we see God.* We *know* Him not by hearsay, not by scription, but by ourselves and for ourselves ; or we should evitably cease to believe in Him, and the idea of God, as v as all belief in His existence, would perish and disappear fr among men. Not only the obedient and rejoicing faith those who seek and enjoy His favor, but also the belief t lies at the bottom of the fear of those who disobey, as well the oaths of those who blaspheme, would inevitably disapp and with it all fear and blasphemy, as well as all hope and joicing, if man had not within him a faculty for seeing knowing God, as an existing reality or an abiding and eter fact. But even this cognition and experience, as Mr. Mau so feelingly and earnestly urges, implies a personal cognit and knowledge of God—a seeing of Him darkly, dimly, p haps, through all the mists and films of sin, yet seeing H distinctly enough to know that He is, and to feel that bles are they who know Him better, and obey his blessed will.

The question then would arise, whether, in the case of a p son removed from these traditional notions, or where they so corrupted as to furnish no satisfactory object to the religi feelings, the feelings themselves would exist. On the se mental theory, of course they would. And on our theory t would also, but for a different reason. In their view th emotions should exist, and lead to the knowledge of God. our view the idea or knowledge of God, which is insepara from the exercise of insight, as the knowledge or idea of c is from the exercise of the physical sense of sight, would in cases exist very early as the intellectual antecedent of thei emotions. We think the emotions always exist, and are ma ifested very early—the young and the ignorant are always everywhere especially susceptible to them, and consequen especially liable to be led away into superstition and idola if they are not guided and enlightened by a better knowle than that which their own unaided faculties or the darkn of heathenism will give them.

And here again all the facts that we know, all the analo of the case, are against the supposition that the emotions p cede the idea of God, or those acts of worship, &c. which

unaided and untaught mind would perform. Such feelings, if they existed, could only make the person unhappy, wretched, without knowing what ailed him, or the remotest idea of what could relieve him. His feelings would lead him to no act designed for relief, to no act except such as would be the natural expression of his sadness and distress. Even in the case of eating, hunger of itself never prompts to the act, until after, by eating, we have learned that eating will relieve us. The first acts of eating are of the class which physiologists call con-sensual. They are produced by either (1) the taste and touch of some object in the mouth leading to mastication and deglutition, or deglutition without mastication; or (2) the smell of some object which excites to search and prehension, and then to mastication and deglutition, &c. But in either case, there is an act of cognition, or at least a sensation produced either by taste or smell, which leads to the act of eating. The sensation passes up by one nerve or set of nerves, and returns as emotion by another; and the function of eating may be performed at any time, and is certainly performed at first without any act of the intelligence, any idea of what the infant is doing, any idea of the object which it eats.

But the main fact is, that the hunger, of itself, and by itself, does not lead men to the act that satisfies it. It is the cognition of the object, or, at least, contact with it, either by touch, taste or smell, one or all of those senses, which leads and stimulates to the act that satisfies the hunger, and so to that series of acts by which we come to know what will satisfy us, and to form an idea of the object for which we hunger. So in disease, also, heart-burn will give pain, but it does not lead a child to eat or drink until it is told by its parent or nurse that eating or drinking the object presented as medicine will relieve it of its pain. Following these analogies, which seem to establish the law concerning the mere constitutional acts, we must conclude that these theistic instincts, if they should exist, could lead to no act expressive of them as distinct from any other unpleasant emotions. Without some cognition of the object which they would lead us to worship and adore, they could not even manifest themselves in their appropriate

character, or show us what they are, without cognition of God; a cognition which, from the nature of the case, can be made only by the insight. Even in the lowest forms of animal life, as in the rhizopoda, the amœba, for example, where there is no indication of any sense but that of feeling, the animal is first brought into actual contact with the food, before any act specifically indicative of hunger is manifested. It may be, also, that the antennæ of insects subserve the same purpose by the sense of feeling. But when we rise to the vertebrate animals, the sensation produced by actual taste or smell of the article that will satisfy the hunger is necessary, as the condition of any manifestation of hunger, as such, and as anything more than a distress that might proceed from some other cause. In many cases there is really no *cognition* of the object, properly so regarded; there is no *necessity* for any in any case. The sensation or excitation of the senses of taste and smell pass up to their ganglionic centers, and the emotion returns, which lead to the acts which lay hold of or appropriate the objects of the appetite. And such, we suppose, must be the case with all emotions of whatever class or variety, which have no intellectual antecedents, they can only of themselves give pain; but the moment an object which will satisfy that pain and remove the distress is cognized or brought in contact with any of the senses which sustain the appointed relations to the emotions they lead to the acts which manifest the peculiar character of the emotions themselves, at the same time that they gratify them. In men, as we have said, these senses are taste and smell. Not even sight or touch of any article of food will lead to the manifestation of the specific character of hunger, unless we have previously tasted of or known something concerning the article, and so connect it with our emotions by an act of intelligence.

From all this we infer, that not only can the theistic emotions not lead to or furnish the elements for the formation of the idea of God, but that they cannot, without some cognition of Him, even lead to any of those acts which express the theistic emotions, as such, or show that they, as distinguished from anything else that may give distress or unrest, exist without

an actual cognition of the object of such emotions, and that cognition, in this case, can be only by an act of insight. Hence we infer that the theistic emotions must be not of the class of appetites, but rather of the class of affections, implying an intellectual antecedent, which is the occasion of their existence, and by which they are determined, as all the affections, are by their intellectual antecedents in their specific character.

From this view of the case we infer, also, that no mere traditional idea of God, and no idea of Him derived from revelation to us through another person, could possibly develop the theistic emotions. No permanent and abiding feeling can be kept up in that which we do not see or feel. Our fear or hope, our love or hate, may be excited by descriptions of what we have never seen. But such emotions soon pass away, unless we are continually seeing the object that excited them, or are constantly receiving new proofs of its reality, so that they are excited anew by those proofs. We soon begin to doubt if such an object exists, or if it deserves to be feared, loved or hated, &c., until all such emotion cease from our bosom.

One further inference. We infer that the debasing rites of idolatry and superstition common to all the forms of heathenism and savage life, are not the *natural* expression of the religious sentiments—but that heathenism and idolatry are a degeneracy, an education in false and perverse systems, debasing the mind from its natural instincts—diverting the affections, which should flow out to the One True God, to idols and fetiches, or the mere farcical duties of a fabulous mythology. The feelings are natural and flow from the dim and mysterious perception of God in the soul, God in his works. And these feelings have a natural object, even Him, Whom the untutored savage hears in the wind or sees in the storm, knowing full well, unless a false system has taught him differently, that neither the wind nor the storm is Himself, nor yet any idol or fetich which custom and tradition may teach him to bow down to and worship. But these, and such as these, are not the *natural objects* of his devoutest feelings; they could call forth no such acts of worship as he pays to them, any more than the smell of the most disgusting filth could cause the mouth to

move as in the act of eating, were it not for the misleading the perverting, the debasing influence of the superstitions i which such benighted heathen are brought up.

Now from these facts and considerations we infer that th cognition of God precedes the theistic emotions. We mus not indeed suppose that there is any definite or well forme idea of His character and attributes, but a dim vague vision c Him ; not an idea of Him as a good man, old and gray headec sitting on a splendid throne or riding on the winds, but a dir vision of Him as something invisible and incomprehensible that appears in the beauty of Spring and the rainbow, th sublimity of Autumn and the thunder and the storm, in th kindness of friends and the mercies of daily life, of the Bein who wrought miracles by Moses, spoke by the prophets, an was revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ ; will be our final Judge Reward and Portion. To the fullness and adequacy of thi idea of God we attain and progress only gradually ; the visio of Him is among the earliest we have ; and the religious emo tions are for the most part awakened and brought out as earl in the life of the child as those of any other kind. This though of God may be neglected and lie dormant, as may those of an other object or person, until finally there comes an awakening when the sense of God's presence is overwhelming, filling u with fear and remorse and shame, until after a sense of pardo these feelings give place to joy and hope and peace in believing

Another fact in the philosophy of cognition which has bee generally overlooked by some metaphysicians, will prove, whe fully considered, equally fatal to Pantheism as those alread considered will to Atheism and Materialism. It is this, that i cognition there is always a co-ordination of two distinct ob jects. If a man is deaf, he has no idea of silence any mor than of sound. If blind, no idea of darkness. But let th deaf hear and the blind see, and they get at once the coördi nate ideas of light and darkness, of sound and silence. If w put our hands in warm water and hold them there for a whil we soon cease to feel that we are touching anything ; take thei out and we feel the change, feel the cooler air.

Now it holds with regard to all the senses but sight, that coördination of two *successive* stages of something is sufficient for cognition, as in the case of silence and sound just referred to, and also in the case of the hands in warm water, &c. But in regard to sight and to insight also, there must be a coördination of two different objects *at the same instant*, or we can see neither. In absolute dark we see nothing, neither can we or do we see anything in light if all objects are of precisely the same color and shade of color. If there are two objects before the eye, of precisely the sames hade, with no mark, shadow, or anything of the kind between them, eye cannot by the eye discriminate them as two. Precisely so if all objects were thus without difference of color, light or shade; we could never see any one as distinct from the other.

So, likewise, with insight; and we would only refer to the case already mentioned, of a child's discriminating reading from jabbering. Let him have an insight of reading, so as to know and understand what it is, and he understands also, and at the same instant, what jabbering is; but not before, and neither without the other.

And thus it is that all our coördinate terms arise; light and darkness, silence and sound, matter and spirit, sickness and health, savage and civilized, (savages have no term to denote savage life,) time and eternity, finite and infinite, cause and effect, Creator and created, &c., &c. If there were but one thing, universally and individually one, we could not cognize it, or know its existence; there could be no consciousness, no thought, no knowledge. And this is but what the philosopher knows and affirms, when he says that all cognition, as well as conception, is by means of Essentia and Differentia; Essentia, or the objects could not exist. But Differentia implies that there are two objects, and not one, else a property could not be a Differentia; difference is only where there are two or more to Differentiate.

Unity is, indeed, of several kinds, as numerical, individual, specific, and essential. Numerical unity needs no explanation, for our present purpose. Individual unity is sameness of object under different alternate conceptions, as "General

Washington," and "the first President of the United States," are alternate conceptions of one object, individually one and the same. Specific unity implies individual diversity. Two objects are specifically the same, when they belong to the same species—as any two men, horses, &c., &c. Objects are essentially the same, when they belong to the same genus.

Besides these, there is sometimes mentioned, also, a "*substantial* unity." Objects to be coördinated in cognition, by sight and insight, must, from the nature of the case, be both numerically and individually different, but they *may* be both essentially and specifically one and the same. But this unity does not constitute Pantheism. We could have no idea or conception of God, if He were not individually distinct and different from ourselves. He may, however, be, in a broad sense, specifically the same as we are. We are said to have been created in His image. We have, as He also has, intelligence, will, and a moral nature, and are thus specifically alike, if we will make these properties differentia of species. But, as we have just said, although this unity, though sufficient for and in fact necessary to the act of cognition by sight or insight, does not of course constitute, or satisfy the demands of Pantheism; that system demands and supposes a *substantial* unity. But, in fact, there is no such unity, except within the sphere of individual unity. Objects, to be substantially one; must be individually one. For example; there are before me two pieces of paper, specifically the same; they came off from the same sheet; but individually they are diverse. So, too, they are substantially different; the substance of the one is not the substance of the other. Perhaps it is like it; but the same it is not; otherwise they would not be two, but one and the same.

The theory of one substance, common to many individuals, is an absurd creation of the fancy. Whatever is, or exists, or is cognized, exists and is cognized as an individual, and by itself. We may have a mass, which, while it exists *as a mass*, is substantially one; but divide it into parts and the parts are individually different. They are *substantially* different also; the substance of the one is not the substance of the other,

otherwise they would not be two, but one mass. But the supposition of a universal substance, out of which all particular and individual forms of objects have been made, is a pure fiction, an absurd creation of the fancy. And, even if it were true that there was such a substance, it could not be cognized or thought of, since, in order to cognition or thought, we must have differential and individual properties for the object. We cannot see or cognize a piece of iron, for example, merely *as iron*; it must be some particular piece, with such a shape and color, in such a place, &c.

Now, to apply all this; to see God, or to think of Him, He must be individually different from ourselves, and so *substantially* different. He may be like us, and we like Him; but Himself, either individually or substantially, we are not, and cannot be, since, if we were, we could neither cognize Him, nor think of Him. Nor, were He merely the general substance, of which we are parts, or of which we and all other objects are only individual forms, and visible manifestations, as Pantheism holds, could we cognize Him at all, know of or prove His existence: nay, He could not exist; for, whatever exists, exists as an individual unit, in and by its own substance, and is therefore *substantially* different from any other object in existence; *substantially* different from others, though quite possibly, specifically and essentially the same.* Hence, we know as certainly and as absolutely, that God is not the one substantial all, which Pantheism represents Him to be, as we know that He exists at all. Nay, if he were such a substance, we could not know of his existence at all, could not even think of Him; the supposition would destroy the very conditions of cognition and of thought, and so of consciousness. And we fully believe that the existence of a God, who is Infinite, Eternal, Personal, Creator and Moral Governor of all things, and who is both individually and substantially distinct from every other object of cognition and thought, can be demonstrated from the elements, first principles, and primary

* We are aware that our language may be thought to be inconsistent with the doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity, affirmed in the Nicene Creed, where the Son is declared to be "*of one substance with the Father.*" But in the first

facts, stated in this article, with as much rigor of demonstration, and with as irresistible force of certainty, as any proposition in mathematics whatever. And when we have a philosophy that establishes these principles, and furnishes this demonstration, we shall have a *Christian* philosophy; one which shall lead us on and up to those great facts and principles which are beyond the limits of philosophy, and which revelation alone can teach. To the "religious thought," properly understood, we see no necessary limits. To the *comprehension of religious objects*, there are of course limits; limits necessarily resulting from the finiteness of all human minds; and there is, therefore, a domain into which philosophy can enter only in the humble attitude of guide to facts and truths which she could never have discovered, and cannot even hope to explain. But a philosophy, true or false, man will have, and must have. He cannot do without it, without ceasing to think altogether. And a philosophy that is true, that *correctly* apprehends and describes the primary facts and functions of intelligence, and the laws which guide it in all its acting, cannot be unfriendly to Revelation, or to any system of theology or worship, that has any foundation in truth, or can long be of any real use to men. Nay, any and every system of theology, and any and every *pretended* Revelation must and will give way before the solid, sure advances of the human intelligence, if they at all conflict with such advances. Three centuries ago, everybody not only

---

place, the word translated "substance," in the Greek, *οὐσία*, does not mean substance in the sense in which we have used the word. It means rather "essence," and denotes the essential nature rather than the substantial identity of objects. And so, where at the close of the Creed the Council condemned those who say that "the Son of God was made * * * of another *substance* or *essence*," *ὑπόστασις*, or *οὐσία*, they indeed used a word which might etymologically be understood to denote substance in the sense intended above. But we doubt if that idea was then elaborated or distinctly considered. It seems to us to belong to *modern* philosophy. In fact we have no recollection of meeting with it before the writings of Kant. *Precisely* what the Nicean fathers meant, or *precisely* what is the relation of the persons in the Trinity, we presume no one will undertake to say—the doctrine is a mystery. But what we have said is no mystery. Two objects cannot be *substantially* one in the sense in which we use the word, and in the sense in which it is used in Pantheism, any more than they are or can be *numerically* one.

believed that the earth stood still, and the sun and moon, &c., revolved around it, but they believed also that that doctrine was taught in the Bible, as certainly as the doctrine of a Saviour for lost men. Now, no one believes the doctrine, and no one supposes that the sacred writers really intended to teach such a doctrine. And in like manner, if any doctrine in science, natural or metaphysical, comes to be established *beyond question or doubt*, and universally received; any doctrine, we say, which requires a modification of anything that we had been accustomed to believe that the Bible has taught, that modification will undoubtedly and inevitably be made. And we certainly regard it as one of the evidences of the Bible's being what it claims to be, and one that is by no means the most inconsiderable, that it has been found, thus far, to contain really nothing in the line of its direct and intentional teaching, which requires even a modification, in order to accommodate it to any discoveries or attainments in modern science. No book of purely human origin could have so well foreseen and avoided such collisions. Some accommodation to the languages and uses of the times in which the sacred writers lived, was natural and inevitable. But they have never adopted such notions, never so interwoven them with the messages they had to deliver, as to make the truths of Revelation in any way dependent upon these errors and ignorances, in matters of pure science. On the contrary, with each new discovery in science, each step in advance in its triumph over the domains of ignorance and superstition, the truths of Revelation shine out all the more clearly; and the more obvious does it become, that the Bible is none other than the word of God.

And we may carry this thought one step further, and say, in regard to any false system of religion that now prevails, or has prevailed, Greek, Roman, Chinese, Hindoo, Buddhist or Mahometan, that if we could cause the scientific truths, which *all* now know, to be diffused and received among the devotees of these false systems, it would as completely wean and alienate them from this false religion and idolatry, as their conversion to Christianity by the preaching of the Gospel alone could do. It would not, indeed, accomplish the same positive beneficial

spiritual result, but it would cause a rejection of the false systems of religion. It would uproot them from their very foundations, expose their absurdities, their manifest errors in matters of fact, and in the exposition of facts. And some such culture in the mere matters of science, seems to be necessary to the secure footing and permanent influence of the Christian revelation in heathen lands; the two must, in some sense, go together; the Christian religion and the science and civilization which it has produced, and which are based upon it.

And so in our own land, these discussions will change our ideas of the Divine character. Doubtless the student of natural science finds a tendency in his particular department towards Materialism, to identify God with nature, and nature with God, and to believe that there is no God but nature. The student of metaphysical science, especially, if he be of an idealistic or mystic turn of mind, will have to contend with a tendency to identify God with thought and law, and so become virtually, if not professedly a Rationalist and a Pantheist. And so, too, the divine, and practical theologian, studying, expounding, and enforcing upon himself and others the moral government of God and the covenant of His mercy in Christ Jesus, will be constantly under the influence of a tendency to anthropomorphism—to the illustration of the personality and character of God by the personality and character of man,—to represent Him, who is Eternal, as in and of time—the Infinite as only an incomprehensibly great Finite Being—Him who changes not and needs not our services, as though he could be benefited by it; as loving and hating—rewarding with affectionate partiality or punishing with vindictive hate—and thus belittling and narrowing down the conception of the Divine character, until the men of science and the men of metaphysical acumen, find little or no resemblance between the God presented to their faith in the popular theology, and Him whom they see in the beautiful and grand of nature's objects, or in the mysterious revelations of law and all-embracing thought. And thus it is that so-called Atheism abounds, and treatises of the evidences are in requisition and religious conviction—especially among the educated classes and men who do their own thinking for themselves—become rare and difficult of production. Doubtless there are errors or

both sides. We have pointed out and condemned with no reserve or sparing of severity, the errors of philosophy and the faults of philosophers. Let us also, as theologians, confess our own faults. The moment we make the personality of God too human, we provoke thinking men to deny His personality; the moment we make him too anthropomorphic in His attributes, His requirements of men and dealings with them, we provoke many who are honest, earnest and sincere, to deny His existence altogether. Let us remember that we cannot comprehend Him; that in a most important sense He is "beyond the limits of thought;" and that to our narrow thoughts and imperfect vision, propositions concerning Him, which may *seem to us* contradictory, may nevertheless be true; for *supposed* inconsistencies are not always contradictions in terms, nor yet in the nature of that to which they pertain. Most objects appear differently when seen on different sides, or from different points of view. And God, if he is indeed seen of us all, yet *comprehends* us all, and is comprehended and so seen on all sides by no one. Let us therefore hope and look forward to the time when by the correction of errors in our systems of philosophy—by emptying ourselves of something of our narrowness and self-conceit, we may all, by whatever processes, and from whatever starting points, come to see Him as He is, One God in Three Persons—a Holy Trinity, over all blessed forever. Hundreds and thousands there are in every country where a highly advanced civilization has been attained, who will not believe in God, if we represent Him as the Stern Fate of Hopkinsianism—or the promoter of the debaucheries of Mormonism—or as delighting in the moral depravity and childish puerilities of Romanism. And they, who inculcate false views of His character, must be held accountable for much of the unbelief that prevails within the sphere of their influence and their teachings. We can persuade no man in this age to believe in the Apollo of the Greeks, or in the Jupiter of the Romans. The advances which we have made in the sciences of matter and of mind, have contributed to this result no less truly than Revelation itself. The three must be in harmony—handmaids co-operating, though in different ways, and with different degrees of power and influence, to the same result—the knowledge of Him whom to know is life eternal.

Art. II.—NEW GOSPEL IN NEW ENGLAND, AND TH CHURCH.

Events of a very extraordinary theological character havin recently transpired in Connecticut, and facts of a like impo being of frequent occurrence in New England, we have bee only waiting for materials by the aid of which we might be en abled to present a faithful record of the whole matter to ou readers. We are not prompted in making this notice by cur osity. We are not moved by a petty feeling which glories i the decadence of a sect that has always, from the day of it birth, been one of the bitterest opponents of the Church, an has not always been scrupulous in the choice of its weapon But, we believe, that developments, daily and rapidly presen ing themselves, are showing, as never has been shown befor the position which The Protestant Episcopal Churc occupies, and is to occupy in this New World, this Great Re public. And we believe, also, that the time has come to spea upon this subject, as we have never spoken before.

The *New York Observer*, of Feb. 23d, 1860, has a state ment of facts respecting a late Congregational Ordination i Hartford, Conn., which, considering its source, we prefer t give, and in its own language, whole and entire.

We are reminded by the present crisis of theological affai in New England, of an anecdote, which, though somewha homely, is so pertinent, that we cannot refrain from giving i Many years ago, a country mechanic—an unlettered, hug plain, blunt man, of stentorian voice and slow of speech shrewd and honest, though making ,no great professions o piety—had been grossly and cruelly cheated in a bargain by neighbor, whose wealth, and position, and pretensions, were shield to the little acts of trickery and meanness, with whic he ground the face of the poor, and for which he was some what notorious. On one hot summer's day, as the huge an *brusque* mechanic sat in the shade of his domicil, still smar ing under some recent wounds, he saw the wealthy Mr. Scre

slowly approaching at a distance in his carriage; whom he steadily eyed, and as he drew near, arrested with the following salutation: —" Screw-Screw-what-do-you-guess-I-was-thinking-about-you ?" " Well, really, Mr. Forge, I don't know; nothing bad I hope." "No-nothing-bad-I-was-thinking-that-if the-devil-don't-have-you-we-may-as-well-not-have-any-devil."

We say, and say frankly, that if the sentiments contained in the papers which we now give, are not Heresy, we may as well not have any Heresy.

"NEW GOSPEL IN NEW ENGLAND.

False doctrines taught: boldly encouraged: the reformation demanded.

Not a week passes without our receiving fresh evidence of a lamentable defection from the truth, on the part of some of the ministers and churches in New England. Recently we were told of a pastor in good standing among the orthodox, who preached a series of sermons on the "faults of Jesus Christ." More of the pastors find faults in the Bible, which their own fancy is summoned to repair. In some cases the people have become more rapidly degenerate than their pastors. The influence of corrupt and corrupting periodicals, which, under the guise of philanthropy, have introduced contempt for the old time-honored doctrines of the churches, have perverted the faith of many, and led them to prefer the excitement of contention, to the service of Christ and the obedience of the truth.

A clergyman in Connecticut recently attended an ordination in a very prominent church, where the candidate was publicly examined as to his theological sentiments: he had no temptation or disposition to conceal them, as the clergymen, who composed the examining body, though professedly on the same platform with the orthodox churches of New England, are not disposed to resist the defection which now threatens such serious results. The intelligent correspondent who was present, states that the candidate rejected emphatically the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; was not clear on the Trinity; doubted as to the use of the word *person;* denied that God has a holy nature or man a sinful nature; he held that the gospel is not absolutely necessary to the salvation of adult heathens, some of them being undoubtedly saved without it; he held that after death and before the final judgment there is a state for all souls, where some who had died impenitent, some who had rejected Christ in this life, would have a new offer of Christ and salvation and the gift of the Holy Ghost and be

saved: so that, if called to the death-bed of an impenitent sinner, and knowing that he had but a short definite time to live, he would not shut him up to faith in Christ within that time, or final ruin. These views were in direct conflict with the articles of the church, to which every private member is required to give his assent. Yet they were not regarded by the Council as a disqualification for preaching in an orthodox Congregational church in Connecticut.

The clergyman, who communicates these facts, remarks with great force and propriety: "I hope that I am not a vain alarmist. Far be it from me to utter a word which should needlessly disturb the peace of our churches. But can any candid mind look at the events so often now occurring, and not feel that there is a process going on silently but surely, which by another generation must entirely change the character of our churches?

"And one of the saddest things about it all is, that if any man is found to express anxiety about these things—if any man arises who feels it to be a solemn duty to God to protest against the incoming errors, his reward is overwhelming ridicule as a man behind the age, or violent denunciation as a troubler of Israel.

"But God is the judge. The day is coming which will reveal every man's work of what sort it is. My strong conviction is, that, unless there shall soon be a mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the day is not distant which will witness a more extensive and appalling apostasy in New England than we have ever yet seen; and that apostasy will be into Universalism. May God in his infinite mercy avert the catastrophe."

This letter is in harmony with what we hear from various quarters. The fact that a respectable number of ministers, in any part of our country, would consent to induct such a teacher as this candidate into the ministry, to preach such another gospel as the above, is enough to fill with painful apprehension the mind of every Christian who believes the truths there denied to be essential to the integrity of the gospel of Christ. We are, however, well satisfied of the correctness of the statement that the public mind in many places is now so thoroughly debauched by fanaticism, that no human wisdom can foretell the plunge which may soon be made. Apostasies are generally gradual. Scarcely any great defection in church history, however, has been so rapid as that which is now rushing to its crisis in New England.

To turn back the tide of corruption, to strengthen the things that remain, to save the rising generation from being borne away into the mire and misery of Pelagianism and Universalism, is a work that

should command the active and untiring energies of every sound man in the church. Pastors should lift up no uncertain or trembling voice at such a time as this. The people, who love the faith of the noble fathers of New England, whose wholesome doctrines have been incorporated as the preserving salt in almost the whole body of sound churches in this country, the people ought to take the alarm, and by watchfulness, prayer and faithful labor, fortify themselves, their families and their neighbors against the inroads of this moral pestilence. Daily we behold the gathering evidence that a new reformation, the Reformation of the 19th century, must be preached, and the Word of God, the doctrines of the cross, the faith of the Reformers and the Puritans, the system known as the EVANGELICAL, must be re-established in the heart of the people, to the expulsion of that rationalism, or semi-infidelity, that now threatens the ruin of the churches."—*N. Y. Obs. Feb.* 23, 1860.

But this is not all. Recently, four young men, students in the Theological Seminary of Yale College, were licensed as preachers by the "New Haven Conn. West Association of Congregational Ministers." Against their being licensed, two of the Examiners openly protested; and as their published Protest reveals the doctrines thus not only taught, but endorsed, and publicly commended to the Congregational community and the public at large, we give the Protest in full.

"PROTEST.

We, the undersigned, members of the New Haven West Association, do hereby respectfully *protest* against the action of said Association, at their meeting held Nov. 29th, 1859, in voting to grant a license to preach and to teach in the churches to Messrs. Fisk P. Brewer, James M. Whiton, Wilder Smith, and Solomon J. Douglass, and we thus protest:—

1st. In the case of Mr. Brewer; because he expressed the following as his belief on theological and religious subjects; to wit—that the Bible *contains* a revelation from God to man, but that he is not certain that all the books of the Bible are divinely inspired; that the genuine saving conversion of adults may be produced by the Holy Spirit without faith in Christ; that man is active in his own regeneration; that Christ died only to make salvation possible for all men without exception; that infants are on the same level with animals as respects the reason for which they suffer:—that he does not understand the use or

the theological meaning of the term *imputation*;—that the unrenewed sinner has ability to do all that God requires of him; and that man is not a sinner until moral agency commences, and until he personally commits sin by which we understand him to mean, that all sin consists in voluntary transgressions of known law; and because also in giving an account of his religious experience, he said not a word in regard to sin or redemption by the blood of the Lamb; but only that he purposed to serve God and consecrate himself to Christ; and said he would direct a sinner, asking what he should do to be saved, to begin to serve God and consecrate himself to Christ, thus pointing the sinner rather to the *law* than to the *Gospel*, to *doing* than to *believing*.

2d. In the case of Mr. Douglass,—because, in addition to his implied assent, given in silence, to the above mentioned views expressed by Mr. Brewer, he also said that the Atonement or redemptive work of Christ, does not secure the salvation of any man, and implied his belief in a gracious ability given alike to all under the sound of the Gospel.

3d. In the case of all the above mentioned candidates for licensure they gave a tacit assent to all the above mentioned views as tenets of their faith, and all explicitly denied a belief in the imputation of Adam's sin to the race, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers as the only ground of justification, or in any sense whatever said that faith comes in the place [has the nature] of works, and that believers in Christ will finally be judged according to their *works* and because also they said, that if they understood the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, they did not *believe it*.

4th. Because all the candidates evinced only a superficial knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures, and of Systematic Theology, showing that instead of being teachers, they have need that one teach them which be the first principles of the oracles of God.

All which is respectfully submitted to this Association of Ministers of the Gospel, by

Their brethren in Christ,

(SIGNED) WM. B. LEE.
J. S. JUDD.

New Haven, Nov. 29th, 1859."

Remarkable as the above statement is, we are not yet through with the record. A gentleman, evidently well posted in theological matters in New England, writes to the (Philadelphia) *Presbyterian*, of Feb. 11th, 1860, and reports instances of gross

doctrinal defection among the New England Puritan ministers. He says:

"These are not isolated cases. In one form or another they are constantly occurring around us. No body reports them. Few care for them. The process is going on silently but effectually. Let the present generation of true Christians pass away, and, unless there be a mighty interference of Divine grace in the existing churches, or the introduction of another and purer form, the prospect for New England is dark and dreary. It is notorious that five of the students of Andover last year rejected the doctrine of future punishment. It is equally well known that the faith of many is unsettled upon this great doctrine. The awful thunder of revelation is whispered down to this, "Excuse me for saying you are all sinners." The most popular preacher in the Congregational body said to a friend of mine, "If Christ were on the earth now, He would not preach to sinners as He did —he preached to his times," &c. The bearing of all this is plain enough and solemn enough. There is a wide departure from the old faith of New England, and of the Scriptures, and if that faith was true this is false."

Our object in giving the above papers is simply to place them prominently on record as a part of the history of our times; to show, even on their own testimony, what sentiments are already held, and taught, and endorsed, in New England, to a large extent the great centre and source of educational and theological influences. Especially through all the West and North-West do these influences reach, and with controlling power. To what avail is it, for example, that "Father Chiniquy" and his French Colony have escaped the meshes of Popery, if they are to be entangled in such a net as this? And yet that they are to be exposed to its influence, is morally certain.

We have little to say now as to the causes which have operated in bringing about the present aspect of the religious Creeds of New England. We have already expressed ourselves freely upon this point in our examination of "Professor Fisher's History of the Church of Christ in Yale College." (Ch. Rev. Vol. XI. No. II,) and in our remarks upon "The New Liturgy in Harvard University," (Ch. Rev. Vol. XI. No. IV,) and to those Articles we refer the reader. It is a signifi-

cant fact, that in both the instances of Ordination above referred to, the points of doctrine rejected by the Candidates, embraced not only Doctrines vital to the Faith of Christ, but also metaphysical subtleties and speculations which by the Early Puritans were not only held as opinions, but they were appended as additions to, and improvements upon, and substitutes for the Primitive Creeds, and were so made by them Articles of Faith and essential to salvation. Here, we have one great secret of the decline of the Faith throughout all Puritan Christendom; and also of the war upon Creeds now carried on so mercilessly and successfully, by such persons as "the Beecher family," and by the large class of writers which they represent. The mistake made by the Early Puritans in this matter, as in some others, was a fatal one. In aiming to be wiser than Inspired Apostles, they simply failed. There is no mystery in these doctrinal developments of our own times, to which we have called attention. They are the natural, inevitable result of a certain Law of Cause and Effect, which in its operations is as fixed and unchanging as the Eternal Throne of God.

What the effect of this movement, this rending and shivering of theological platforms, this wreck of the Faith in the popular sentiment, is to be on those among them who still adhere to the Doctrines of the Cross, is what we cannot divine. Will they return to that old Mother Church which they deserted three centuries ago? Why not? There is not a single objection which the Early Puritans urged against the Church, which has not been obviated. Her Faith, her orthodoxy is unquestioned. Her Ritual, her Services, are commanding the homage of men outside of her Fold; and the popular mind is fast becoming toned up to an appreciation of her Worship. Again we say, why shall not multitudes of these distracted and disheartened believers find refuge from the storm within the Church's enclosure? Ah, there are many among us who know what struggles it costs ere that point is reached, struggles which the heart can never tell; which God only knows. Thank God, the Church is already reaping rich harvests in these troublous times. Talent, learning, piety, of no common

order, are quietly consecrating themselves to Christ at our Altars, and to a much greater extent than is generally supposed. But the multitudes of souls among them, hungering and thirsting for the Bread and Water of Life—who is to feed them? An old fashioned "orthodox" Puritan, in commenting upon the conversion of the Rev. Dr. Huntington to the Church, says, "There was no other place for him to go." Of course there was not.

But whatever may be the effect of these doctrinal developments among the Puritans themselves, there are certain lessons to be gathered by Churchmen, which it would be the sheerest madness not to give heed to.

They ought to learn, the duty of presenting with authority, and with the greatest boldness, a Positive Faith to our age and times. The time has gone by for dilutions. The age is too earnest for the man who has nothing to say. It calls for the Faith—the Faith in its primitive simplicity, untainted by, and unmixed with Philosophy of any sort; and especially, with the speculations and cavils of the skeptical, conceited, shallow philosophy of our day. It is a notorious fact, that German Neology, German principles of Exegesis, German text books, German habits of thought, are all blended in, and mixed with this doctrinal Chaos, this wreck of Creeds and Platforms with which the face of New England is strewed. God grant that our Theological Professors, and our younger Clergy now coming upon the stage, may have grace and wisdom to understand their vocation. Pride of intellect, an ambition to be regarded as a "great thinker," to seem to dare the heights and depths of God's Infinite Wisdom in the Gospel of His Son,—this is the besetting sin of our age. That "great mystery" "concerning Christ and the Church," which St. Paul speaks so earnestly of, (Eph. v. 32.) is no mystery at all now-a-days. The Romanist on the one hand, and the Rationalist on the other, can tell us all about it.

Churchmen ought to learn, and to act at all times and on all occasions, as if they had learned the moral treachery of a spurious charity, where the "Faith once delivered to the Saints" is involved. These men call us hard names because they can-

not get into our pulpits, and especially because they cannot get the ear of our Sunday School children.

They ought to learn, that the "New Measure System," in itself a modern thing, which some among ourselves have been desirous to introduce into the Church, has not availed to save even its authors and special advocates from the utter abandonment of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel and of the Cross of Christ.

They ought to learn, that wherever, and for whatever reason, men begin with giving up Christ's Church, Christ's Ministry, Christ's Sacraments, that then, and there, the giving up of Christ's Doctrines is sure to follow. Apostolic Truth and Apostolic Order will always go together. The history of the Church proves this to a demonstration.

And, most of all, they ought to learn, that the preservation of the Faith, and the salvation of men by that Faith, now so emphatically placed in their hands, involves a duty and a responsibility which cannot be trifled with, with impunity. Christ's great work will assuredly be done; even if we prove ourselves too proud, too self-willed, too self-seeking, to be His instruments in its accomplishment. It will be done in His own way. Let us pause, ere we dare carry our whims, our fancies, our conceits, into the Temple and the presence of the Living God.

In connection with this whole subject, there is another point worth making. Because our Clergy do not embark in the so-called Reform movements of the day *as a specialty*, it is more than hinted, that they are "behind the age," that they are "Expediency men," "trimmers," "time-servers," &c., &c. Now, we may perhaps find some excuse for the persons who make these charges, when we remember under what provocations they make them—their congregations dwindling—numbers of their very best families coming over to the Church—hundreds of their parishes in New England remaining for months, and some of them for years, without settled pastors on account of internal dissensions—and the hold of their system upon the public mind growing less and less continually—we say, it is not perhaps strange that they should give vent to

their mortification in such epithets as Churchmen are sometimes greeted with.

Perhaps we can find another excuse for them. It is said, that not long since, one of their preachers was asked by one of his own people, why he did not sometimes preach about something else besides "Abolitionism," and "Total Abstinence?" "Why," said he, "if I don't preach on such subjects, what can I preach about?" Exactly so. There was philosophy in his answer. The man, without knowing it, hit the very nail on the head. If the statements from Congregational and Presbyterian sources, which we have given above, are to be relied upon, surely enough, what else can they preach about? The Gospel of Christ, as a supernatural System, in itself the only source and fountain of true Reform, they have virtually abandoned; and, led on by such a banner as the *Tribune*, and the infidel Socialists who for years have rallied around that standard, they wage a Crusade which they call Reform. Is not this so, literally and strictly? The doctrine of the Trinity abandoned! Man's sinful nature denied! The Atonement ignored! Personal faith in Christ declared unnecessary to salvation! "Not certain that all the Books of the Bible are divinely inspired!" And of course, they themselves are to be the judges, what is inspired and what is not!

Not unlikely it may occur to the reader to ask, whether this long and startling list of negatives and denials, drawn up, too, by a Puritan, allows the men who dare make them, still to be called Christian? And if it does, the question is certainly worth asking, how much of Christianity may be rejected, and yet the name itself be retained? We do not doubt that the hearts and lives of these men, and especially of their people, are, just now, more orthodox than their Creeds; but we forewarn them, that the heart and outward life of a people will always follow after their religious Creed; and that a stream will never rise above its fountain. Germany is, just now, the Mecca of New England Puritan Theology. Are these men unmindful of the shameless debauchery in social life, the practical heathenism, which to so large an extent characterises society in Germany, and which follows, naturally, in the wake

of its theology? We have no room here for the proofs on this point, but the following are specimens.

A gentleman every way qualified to form an opinion, lately in Germany, thus wrote to an American religious paper, from Nuremberg:

"I learned from my ministerial friend that his flock consisted of twenty hundred souls, of whom fifty or a hundred attended church. He remarked that it was difficult to do anything, and was much discouraged. *Immorality, exceedingly gross, one-third of the new population being illegitimate;* no regard paid to the Sabbath, or sacred things; poverty and suffering abounding everywhere—one would think he had cause of sorrow. And yet it is only the same story that I hear everywhere in Germany. * * * * This, to one who feels a universal brotherhood in men, dispels the romance associated with the name of Germany in the new world. Sad, indeed, is the fate of the German people, and darker, still darker grows the future. God only knows what the end shall be."

An American—Prof. Alexander—lately traveling in Germany, gave, on the authority of M. Gasparin, what he calls the practical results of German theology, as follows:—

"Public worship is disregarded. In Berlin, out of four hundred thousand souls, there are three hundred thousand who never attend any of the thirty-two churches. Dr. Tholuck declares, that a few months ago, at Halle, in the principal service of the cathedral, there were present fourteen persons; in another church, six; and in another, five! Next day he attended a sermon, of which he was the only auditor. The theatres are as full as the churches are empty."

A writer in the "Undergraduate," for Jan., 1860, in an Article on "German Student Life and Travel," states; "The chief danger does not appear to me to lie in the fascinating dogmas of Neology propounded in the lecture-room. * * The real danger is much greater than all this, and cannot be avoided. It lies in the manners and customs of the people, in their mode of living and personal behavior, with which one cannot help coming constantly in contact. * * *Indeed, some practices, which he has been accustomed to regard as in the highest degree immoral, are here the rule; and certain vices which he*

would never indulge in at home, or which, if led into them, he would keep secret from his most intimate friend, he will here find openly confessed and laughed about."

If this writer had said, in conclusion, that German debauchery was the natural result of German Theology, he would have drawn a moral suited to the times. This aping of Germany in Puritan New England, and throughout our Northern States, is one of the significant phenomena of our times. German Philosophy was made for the German, and was made for nobody else. It does not hurt him now, and nothing of the kind can; but it will kill New England Puritanism as dead as a herring. The German does not believe his philosophy; he does not pretend to believe it, nor even to understand it. It is a part of his belief not to believe any thing. His holding to it to-day, is no reason why he should hold to it to-morrow; it is a hazy, dreamy unreality; largely, the creature of lager-bier and tobacco smoke—into which this German subjectivity may be, to a great extent, resolved. It is the very last thing in the world which an Anglican or an American mind should ever meddle with. What the Age wants most, is Faith and Virtue. German philosophical theology will destroy both.

These men differ from us, and differ, *toto coelo*, on the whole subject of Reform, its nature, the grounds of its necessity, its methods, &c. Assuming, like the *Cathari* of old, whom in several respects they closely resemble, that they are better than other people, they seem to regard it as their special mission always to be attacking somebody or something: never in a calm, except in a gale; never at peace, except in war. They seem to rest their hold upon Society on the assumed position that they are, *par excellence*, the Reformers of the age. And yet, forgetting the great principle involved in what Dr. Chalmers called the "expulsive power of a new affection," they would reform from without, not from within. They wage an external warfare; they incorporate their pet hobby of the day into political platforms; they turn their pulpits and their altars into rostrums, and strive to accomplish moral ends, by the noise and clap-trap of worldly machinery; and this, they call "preaching up to the times;" these, they say, are the

really "live men!" We might, in return for their compliments, call them quacks, and charlatans; but this would not prove any thing. We have a right, however, to ask the question, whether they are, indeed, the really true philanthropists of the age? And whether this is, in fact, "preaching up to the times?" We more than doubt it. And, what is more, the public sentiment of the country is beginning to more than doubt it. In respect to Intemperance, for example, after all the excitement of the last quarter of a century, these very men confess, on occasions, that this vice is still on the increase throughout the country; and the published statistics of crime, and the lists of importations at our Custom Houses, lead us to suppose that this is probably true. And as to Abolitionism; have they really accomplished their object; or are they very likely to accomplish it? Everybody knows that in several of the slaveholding States, where slavery has ceased to be profitable, and where, a few years ago, measures were being taken for its gradual removal, the movements of these very men have postponed its abolishment for at least half a century; while, throughout the extreme South and South-West, the least that they have effected, has been, to incense public feeling to the highest pitch of intensity, and to provoke men, who are not to be persuaded by such influences, not only to curtail greatly the privileges formerly granted to the slaves, but to contemplate measures to strengthen the institution which would not have been thought of a quarter of a century ago. This is what has been accomplished in the way of reform! And yet, this is the kind of "preaching that is up to the times!"

As to the whole question, what Civil Government has to do with Christian Morality, it is a great question, and one which, in our country, has never yet been met, as Christian Statesmen must meet it, sooner or later. Nor do we here discuss at all the nature of any one of those questions which come, legitimately, before such a tribunal. What we do contend for, is, that with Politics, and with questions which belong to Politics, the Christian Ministry, as such, has nothing to do. It is out of their sphere. Their vocation is a higher, certainly a different one. Christ's "kingdom is not of this world;" and when

He was on the earth, He did not attempt to reform Society in any such way. *Change* is not, necessarily, *reform;* and the history of Society proves Empiricism in Morals to be the shallowest kind of philosophy. It takes with the unthinking masses; any body can dabble in it; it answers well to ring changes on, and to inflame prejudices. Such men as Parker, and Garrison, and Phillips, never seem more in their native element, than when discharging their venom against the Church of Christ; and yet, what would these men bring about, if they could, but another "Reign of Terror?" A scene of unbridled licentiousness, carnage, riot, and wild misrule! Such is the "liberty" they offer, without the Law and Love of God.

Let it not be forgotten that these men differ from us, not only as to the methods and means of all true Reform, but as to the grounds of its necessity. And here we come to the very root of the matter. The point at issue here lies back of all these other questions; it is vital, normal. It is, in fact, the one great moral question of the age. Belief in the inherent goodness and perfectibility of Human Nature will lead men of necessity to a denial of those great doctrines of Revelation, which imply the fact of a Native Depravity. It will deny the Trinity, the Atonement, Regeneration. It will of necessity lead them to a scheme of mere Humanitarianism for the improvement of man's Moral Nature, and to a proud and total rejection of a Supernatural Plan for the regeneration of this Nature, and the well being of Society. "They that be whole have no need of a physician, but they that be sick." Hence, these men differ from us naturally, and radically, on all those great questions and duties of the Social relations which refer to a Supernatural Revelation for their origin and sanction. The Institution of Marriage, the Right of Property, the Sanctity of the Christian Sabbath, the divine authority of Civil Government, these are all, necessarily, involved in the point at issue. Of course, they differ from us also as to the position which the Church occupies in this work of Reform, and they will of necessity strenuously oppose her; for her very first principles sap the foundation on which their whole theory is based. One of their most distinguished lecturers, and a somewhat

noted *litterateur* of the day, is understood to have lately avowed his fixed determination to wage war henceforth against Christianity as a Supernatural System, or as anything more than a mere scheme of Humanitarianism. The man is thoroughly consistent. The contest is one, really, *pro aris et focis;* it is the question, whether the Church of Christ is a reality or an abstraction, whether it is a Visible, Organic, Divine Institution; *in* the world, but not *of* the world; the purchase of His Blood; the object of His perpetual love; His chosen, special instrumentality, wherewith He will bless the world. This, and nothing short of this, is really the prize at stake.

Nor is it a pleasant prospect, to see to what an extent this Humanitarian, Christless theory, has already, directly or indirectly, pervaded the religious opinions and sentiments of the country. Among all the Protestant bodies in the United States, the Church is the only organization which has not been riven and distracted by this question. She stands to-day alone. Amid the warring elements of strife, and discord, and alienation, which now threaten to rend our National Union to fragments, and deluge our land with fraternal blood—a spectacle, sad and awful enough to summon the patriot dead from their graves; and over which tyrants abroad, and mad Vandals at home, already exult in fiendish anticipation—at such a crisis as this, thank God! there is a Church, planted on the Rock of Ages; towering high, far above these sectional questions; unmoved by the storm which rages and dashes at her base! at once, a center and bond of union! a city of refuge! a beacon to the weary, heart-sick mariner! a tower of strength! God's Messenger to the people, speaking words of charity, and forbearance, "Peace on Earth, Good will toward men!" Thousands of noble hearts throughout all our land, not of her Fold, are already paying grateful homage to her lofty position, and are wishing and praying for her prosperity. The best hopes of our nation are largely in her keeping. She has simply Christ's work to do, in Christ's way. Duties are hers, results are God's. And that work she is already doing, and will continue to do, taunted and reviled though she may be, not only by demagogues and mountebanks, whose bribes she spurns, and whose threats

she defies; but by men honest and earnest in their convictions. Her "Church Homes," her "Hospitals," her Missionary Bishops, and her noble band of Missionary pioneers working patiently, faithfully, unrequitedly; her Mission Schools, and her spirit of charity, already waking up to great deeds for Christ—all this, is an earnest of her future history. God grant, that the Church may be faithful to her trust. God forbid, that any earthly, personal, party element of bitterness and strife shall be permitted to divide her counsels, weaken her power, and, thereby, the seamless garment of Christ's One Body be rent in twain. For ourselves, we will give our heart and hand to those who will work for Christ in Christ's way, however strongly we may differ from them in matters of private opinion.

The Church, as we have said, knows nothing of a system of Empiricism. Yet time will show, and is already showing, who is the true, and who the false philanthropist. If the Providence of God is working out one problem more demonstrably than another, it is this; that man's Moral Nature is disordered; that the whole Social Element, in all its forms, is affected by the abnormal, vitiated condition of that Nature; that "God was IN CHRIST, reconciling the world unto Himself;" 2 Cor. v. 19—that Christ is both the Life and the Light of the world; that for man, individually, and for man socially, for man in this world and that which is to come, all his true hopes cluster around, and center in, the CROSS OF JESUS CHRIST. Churchmen can afford, we think, to be called "timid and time-serving men," "behind the age," &c.; they may be told, that "if Christ were on the earth now, he would not preach to sinners as He did," &c., &c.; they may safely bide their time, so that they but rally, humbly, prayerfully, valiantly, around the standard of the "Faith once delivered to the saints." That Faith will finally triumph, and triumph gloriously; and, to this end, the wisdom of this world will first demonstrate its own inherent impotence and folly. Such was the nature, as well as the moral grandeur of the preparation for CHRIST'S First Advent, though unappreciated by Jew or Gentile; and such is at least one element in that silent, yet sure process, by which His Second Advent is to be ushered in.

Art. III.—BISHOP GRISWOLD ON THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE.

That Episcopal Ordination is essential to Ministerial Validity, and that this is one of the first principles in the New Gospel Dispensation, is the point involved in what we have now to offer. That the doctrine of Episcopal Ordination, and such Ordination alone, is held and taught as the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, will not of course be denied. She utters no anathemas against those who claim to be ordained by Presbyters, or by Laymen, or who claim to be Ministers without ordination of any kind. She leaves them to their own masters, and to the great Master Himself. But what she does say, is, that *she* cannot recognise them as Ministers of Christ. She closes against them her pulpits and her altars. Her Canon I, of 1832, says, "In this Church there shall always be three Orders in the Ministry, viz Bishops, Priests and Deacons." And her Canon XXXVI, of 1832, says, "*No person shall be permitted to officiate* in any congregation of this Church, without first producing the evidences of his being a Minister thereof." Even on the lowest ground of expediency, the propriety of such a Canon as the last one cited is obvious; and yet the Sectarian Ministers, and the Sectarian press of the country, seem to be exceedingly and perhaps increasingly restive at it, and are perpetually striving to get Churchmen in one way or another to recognise the regularity and validity of their own Presbyterian and Congregational and lay Orders. The late Bishop Doane was bitterly assailed for a single act of duty in this respect.

In Massachusetts, however, a case has recently come before the public, which again brings up the whole question, and in a form which cannot be evaded. In the village of Wilkinsonville, Mass., the Rev. A. D. Spalter was recently displaced from the Ministry, and he had recently "exchanged" with a "Congregational Minister." The fact of such an "exchange" was immediately published as the reason for the Episcopal censure and displacement, and was of course severely comment-

ed upon, in several Sectarian Newspapers. To this, however, the *Christian Witness*, the official organ of Bishop Eastburn, *and of which he is reported to be Editor*, replies with a positive denial. It says :

"We distinctly denied a few weeks since the misstatement that 'the Rev. A. D. Spalter had been forbidden to preach in the church in Wilkinsonville, because he had exchanged with a Congregationalist minister.'" And again; "It is positively untrue that Mr. Spalter was displaced *on the ground that he had exchanged with a Congregationalist minister.* He was removed from his charge because he was not a clergyman in full standing, but a deacon ordained without passing the regular examinations, and the express provision of our laws is, *that such a deacon shall not have charge of a parish.* Afterward, he was displaced from our ministry, *at his own request*, because he was unwilling to submit to our laws."

In reply to this statement however, a Warden, five Vestrymen, and five other gentlemen of the Parish, publish a Card over their names, in the *New York Observer*, of Feb. 16th, in which they say :

"Knowing the true facts of the case, and having heard the words from the Bishop's lips, we, the undersigned, feel called upon as 'a simple matter of justice,' to give the public a statement which we are prepared to sustain.

The evening of the visitation of the Bishop, a meeting of the Society was called and a committee chosen to wait upon the Bishop, and gain his presence.

At that meeting, in our presence, *he distinctly asserted the fact that it was the matter of exchanges alone which obliged him to censure Mr. Spalter*, and added, that would Mr. S. do so no more, he would be happy to have him continue in charge of the parish as long as he saw fit to remain; to which Mr. Spalter with earnestness replied, 'God being my helper, I will never give them up, for I believe them in accordance with Christ's teachings.'

We solemnly declare, he did not once mention Mr. Spalter's not having received Priest's orders, but only censured him for allowing other ministers to occupy the pulpit."

To this Card, the Bishop, as far as we have seen, has made no reply. The point of veracity between Bishop Eastburn and these eleven gentlemen, we have nothing to do with. The point which astounds us is, that Bishop Eastburn rested, or ever thought of resting his act of discipline on any other ground than that where the Church has placed it. Even dissenters themselves perfectly well understand the rule of the Church in this matter; and we never yet have met an intelli-

gent man among them who did not respect a consistent observance of that rule.

And here we come to the point which, and which alone, leads us to take up this subject in the present connection. For some reason, we do not ask now what that reason is, certain doctrines and teachings, held we know by only a few among us, are put forth in our days not only very industriously, but with the severest denunciations against those who hold to different opinions; teachings, the evident design and inevitable tendency of which are, to utterly change the position in which the Church stands towards the Sects of the country; and the result of which will be to multiply the number of just such broken, distracted parishes as that in Wilkinsonville. Thus, while we write, we see in one of our most widely circulated Church papers, a long and elaborate article, proposing to show how the Church might be commended to "converted Romanists." It is, the writer says, in the slang phraseology of the day, "not by any Laudean or Puseyite approximations," * * but, "by holding on with unfaltering purpose to * * the evangelical type of our Church in all its fullness, its earnestness, *its communion with other denominations of orthodox views &c.*"

Nor is this all. Bishop Eastburn, in his Speech in St. Paul's Church, Boston, Feb. 26th, as reported in his own paper, of March 2d, 1860, distinctly has taken the ground, that the Church *does not exclude* the Ministry of the Sects around us. While impliedly describing the views of those who differ from him, as "frothy opinions," "delusions of formalism," "the inculcation of ceremonials and of the mere reception of Sacraments as the way of acceptance with God in place of the Lord Jesus as the only name whereby we must be saved" &c.; of Bishop Griswold he said, "*In regard to the Ministry*, while he held with tenacity the historical truth that our constitution of the Ministry is that which is sanctioned by Scripture and conformed to the primitive pattern, he yet left the subject where our Prayer Book leaves it, *and did not carry it to any excluding consequences in regard to other professed branches of the Church of Christ.*"

What Bishop Griswold's opinions on the Christian Ministry were, is a simple question of fact, and is not to be decided by the affirmation of Bishop Eastburn or ourselves. We assert, however, that Bishop Griswold *held* and *taught*,—1st, that the Apostolic Office was to be perpetual in the Church ; 2d, that Bishops are Successors of the Apostles ; 3d, that the Three Orders of the Ministry are of divine appointment and perpetual obligation. Bishop Griswold's own language is, and we beg to commend it to the attention of Bishop Eastburn ; "*If God has set three Orders in the Church, I know not who is authorized to reduce them to one.*" And again he says : "*If differing denominations of Christians are ever brought to strive together for the Faith of the Gospel, it will be by their first uniting in the Government, (whatever they may decide it to be) which God has set in His Church.*"

So important is this whole subject intrinsically, and in its bearing on the prosperity of the Church of God in these days of radicalism ; so utterly revolutionary are the views put forth in our times by men making, as we have said, very extraordinary claims for themselves, and uttering very extraordinary judgments against others, that whatever may be our own likes or dislikes as to entering on such discussions ; however we may regard the desirableness of peace and harmony among ourselves, and their binding obligation on us as a high solemn duty, yet the point before us is one which we have no right to blink. As to the Evangelical Doctrines of the Gospel, distinctively so called, Repentance, Faith, Justification through the Atoning Blood of Christ and this alone, if they are preached, earnestly, faithfully, any where in our land, they are certainly so preached by men who hold positive views as to the Institutions of Christ's One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

It is a strange *phantasmagoria* this, that is going on among us, in the new groupings of men under party names. High Churchmen are becoming Low ; and Low Churchmen are becoming High ; men on the look out for the "main chance," are scrambling as fast as they can on to the fence, to see which way the tide is likely finally to set ; and here, we, in Connecti-

cut, whom our good brethren in Virginia used to regard as dry formalists, are pinning our faith on Bishop Griswold's sleeve; or, rather, which is the real fact in the case, we are calling attention to a great fundamental Church principle, which such a man as Bishop Griswold so thoroughly demonstrated, and so firmly held as the very Truth of God. Well, be it so. The last General Convention proved beyond a question, that the old parties of the Church, if not dead, are yet *in extremis*, (peace to their ashes!) and that a new party, which yet is no party, has silently and unconsciously sprung into place and power. The stern logic of facts is showing that the heart of the Church all over the land is thoroughly sick of party, and is rallying resolutely around the Prayer Book as a common standard; and that henceforth that heart is bent on "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace;" remembering that "there is ONE BODY and ONE SPIRIT, even as ye are called in One hope of your calling; One Lord; One Faith; One Baptism; one God and Father of all; Who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Thank God it is so. Men may change; the Truth never. Christ's Ministry in its three-fold Order, in its nature, its powers, its duties, its glorious heritage of His perpetual presence and blessing, is not a thing of expediency; not a matter of preference; not a question of majorities and minorities. Christ himself appointed it; the Church has preserved it. And if the Church utters no maledictions against those who reject it, she guards and will guard, and she will protect the priceless treasure with jealous care, by all the love she bears Him, and by all the hopes she cherishes.

At present, we propose to show what were the views of the late Bishop Griswold in respect to the Christian Ministry; and we give below in full, his Sermon on "The APOSTOLIC OFFICE." Its strong, sturdy, simple Saxon language and style is not less clearly marked, than the severity of its reasoning, and the demonstrative force of its conclusions. We commend the Sermon to the Clergy and Laity of the Church as admirably suited to our own times. There are some other things to be said as to the opinions and sentiments of Bishop Griswold, his hopes and his fears on the whole subject of Church life and

Church growth, which will be more appropriate on another occasion.

The Apostolic Office: being some Brief Remarks on the different Orders of the Christian Ministry. By the RT. REV. ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD, D. D., late Bishop of the Eastern Diocese."

AND JESUS CAME AND SPAKE UNTO THEM, SAYING, ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO ME IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH. GO YE, THEREFORE, AND TEACH ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST; TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THINGS, WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU; AND, LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAY, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD. AMEN. —*Matt.* XXVIII. 18—20.

It appears, from the holy Evangelists, that our Saviour Christ, soon after the commencement of His public Ministry, elected a number of men, and, at three different times, appointed and empowered them to preach His Gospel, to administer His holy Ordinances, and to govern His Church.

Their first election is thus mentioned by St. Mark, iii. 14, 15: "And he ordained (or appointed) twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and cast out devils." The names of the twelve are mentioned. St. Luke, vi. 13, has thus recorded the same transaction: "He called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." Here, too, their names follow. At this, their first election and appointment, they were *named Apostles;* ordained to *be with Him*, that He might *send them forth to preach* and *work miracles.*

After some time, He enlarged their commission, gave them further power, and sent them forth to preach. Of this second appointment, or Ordination, St. Mark vi. 7—13, has given us information: "He called unto him the twelve, (whom he had before appointed to this work) and began to send them by two and two;" and gave them directions how to exercise their ministry. "And they *went out and preached that men should repent.* And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." St. Luke, ix. 1—6, recording this second appointment, says, "He called the twelve disciples (whom he had named apostles) together, and *gave them power and authority* over all devils, and to cure diseases; and he *sent them to preach the kingdom of God,*" which they did; "they departed and went through the towns, *preaching the gospel,* and healing every where."

It is evident, that between the first and second of these appointments or Ordinations to the Ministerial Office, some considerable time elapsed, during which Christ wrought several miracles, spake a number of parables, and gave His disciples much instruction. It is also evident, that in this second commission their power was increased, and their Office enlarged. They were sent to preach the Gospel; and we learn from St. John's Gospel, iv. 1, 2, that they were commissioned to baptize; that they made and baptized more disciples than did John the Baptist. St. John the Evangelist, xv. 16, also informs us that Jesus said to His apostles, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and *have ordained you*, that ye should go and bring forth fruit." And that they had gone and brought forth fruit, had preached, baptized, and wrought miracles with great success, is seen in the texts above referred to. Their final appointment to the highest grade of the Christian Minister, was after Christ had risen from the dead, as we read in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John.

Soon after the second Ordination of the Twelve, "the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them" forth to teach. Thus it appears that during Christ's Ministry, there were three different Orders or grades of preachers. First, Himself, acting as the High-Priest or Bishop, in His own person, and governing the Church; secondly, the Twelve; and, thirdly, the other Seventy.

The law given by Moses was a shadow of good things to come; it in all things typified the Gospel state, and is called "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ." And, accordingly, it had the three Orders of the Ministry—the High-Priest, the Priests, and the Levites—with different and distinct powers and duties.

These facts prepare us to expect that the like number of grades in the Ministerial Office would be continued in the Church after Christ had ascended into heaven. And this expectation is very much confirmed by two other facts, which from the Scriptures are evident. First, that Christ, immediately before He left the earth, advanced His apostles to that rank in His church which He was leaving. "As (he says) my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." And the apostles so understood their commission; they claimed to be ambassadors for Christ, as though God besought men by them; they prayed men in Christ's stead. The other fact is, that not long after, Ministers of a new Order were ordained by the Apostles, called Deacons.

St. Matthew informs us that Christ, in giving His Apostles their final commission, begins by saying, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth;" showing that He had authority to ordain them

to any Ministry. And then, as St. John tells us, He mentions the Ministry, which He actually did give them; such as *the Father had given Him;* he appoints them to the Office which He was leaving. Christ glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest, but had, like Aaron, His type under the law, a regular call to the Office; nor did the Apostles take the honor to themselves; they were sent by Christ, as He was by the Father.

By comparing the Evangelists, we learn what were some of the powers committed unto them. First, to exercise discipline and govern the Church: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." This is sometimes called *the power of the keys;* authority to admit members into the Church, and to exclude from it such as they should judge to be unworthy. They were also commissioned to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever Christ had commanded them, promising salvation to those who should believe and be baptized. He also promised to be with them even to the end of the world, *evidently meaning them and their successors in the same Office.*

Other powers, though not particularly expressed, are also implied. They were sent by Christ, as the Father had sent Him, and, of course, to minister in the Church as He had ministered, and to appoint such Ordinances as the new Dispensation might render expedient; such as ordaining to the Ministry, administering the Lord's Supper, laying on of hands in Confirmation, and appointing the Order of Deacons.

Our Lord added: "These signs shall follow them that believe: in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." These words show that the working of miracles was not peculiar to the Apostles, nor to the Ministers of Christ; those who believed, through their Ministry, it was thus promised, should do those wonders. Miracles were common in the Apostolic age, but were not peculiar to the Apostolic Office. The Seventy wrought miracles; so did the Deacons. Christ did not promise that the working of miracles should continue to the end of the world, *but that he would always be*

*Before Christ's resurrection, they had not been commissioned to baptize in the name of the Trinity; they probably, then, administered the same baptism of water unto repentance, as did John. We cannot reasonably believe that Christ authorized two different baptisms at the same time.

with the Office; that while the world endured there should be continued an uninterrupted Succession of such Officers in His Church, endued with these ecclesiastical powers, and *commissioned to transact with mankind the momentous concerns of their eternal salvation.* The name of Apostle was not long continued. Besides the first twelve, we read only of Matthias, Barnabas, Paul, Epaphroditus, and a few others, who, in the New Testament, are called Apostles.* After their death, their successors in Office, in honor of the first Apostles, modestly, by general consent, assumed the name of Bishops.

This circumstance has led some to suppose, that the Apostolic Office ceased with those who first bore the name. To decide this, you have only to consider what was their Office. Working miracles was not their Office, for others, even laymen, did that. Itinerant preaching, or traveling from place to place, was not peculiar to their Office. This was *the work of an evangelist* then, and of missionaries now; Philip the Deacon did it. Titus was commissioned to travel through Crete, and *to ordain elders in every city. We have already seen to what Office the Apostles were ordained. It was to preach, to baptize, to lay on hands, and to govern the Church. And surely these have not ceased.* Whether they journeyed, like Barnabas and Paul, or were stationed, as James was, at one place, their power and Office were the same.

No one thing has caused so much dispute on the Orders of the Christian ministry, as the promiscuous use of the names given them in the New Testament. What we teach and firmly believe is, that, in the Apostles' days, (as has been the fact ever since,) there were three different Orders; but we do not say, or suppose, that they were distinguished exactly by the same names then as they now are. The words Bishop, Elder, and Deacon, which we now appropriate severally to three different grades, were then sometimes used *for all the orders.* The Apostles were called Elders, and also Deacons. The Elders, Presbyters, or Priests, which are all words of the same meaning, were then also styled Bishops, a name which signifies overseers, because they had the oversight of congregations or parishes. But ever since the Apostles' days, none but those who have the general oversight of all the Churches in a city, or state, or province, with power to ordain, are called Bishops. The Office, or power exercised, is what we regard; the name is of less concern. You must look to their acts, to

---

* The Greek word for Apostles is, in some of the texts in our common translations, rendered *messenger.*

their exercise of their Ministry, if you would ascertain their grade of Office. Titus and Timothy had the Episcopal or Apostolic authority; they had the same authority as those whom we now call Bishops; authority to ordain, to govern the Churches, and to set things in order. Thus St. Paul writes to Titus, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." In Crete there were a hundred cities, and Titus was stationed there for this purpose, to ordain Ministers, and regulate the Churches in all of them. This is precisely the authority which Bishops now have. In Ephesus and parts adjacent, there were many Elders, whom Paul called together and addressed, as we read in the 20th chapter of the Acts. And he left Timothy there, with what we now call Episcopal authority. He gave him much instruction how he should regulate various matters, and cautioned him not to lay hands suddenly on any one. He is particular in telling Timothy what should be the qualifications of those whom he ordained Bishops, and then what should be the qualifications of Deacons; thus clearly showing that Bishops and Deacons were two distinct Orders. Those he calls Bishops in the epistle to Timothy, in that to Titus he calls Elders; they were of the same Order.*

Perhaps some may wish to be informed, why, if there were three Orders of Ministers, was not Timothy to ordain all the three? Why does St. Paul mention only two? I answer, for a very good reason, and very obvious. One of the first, or highest order, was not ordained by a single person; several, holding the Apostolic Office, united in giving such orders. Timothy himself had been so ordained, as we shall presently see; and in all ages of the Church, the same has been the general usage. Several Bishops unite in ordaining a Bishop. Among us, there must be at least three Bishops to ordain one to the same Office, while a single Bishop may, as Timothy and Titus did, ordain Elders and Deacons. Thus, as we pursue the subject, you will see, more and more, that we strictly conform to Apostolic usage.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians is addressed "to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." It has often, and very much been urged, as a proof that there were but two Orders of Ministers in Philippi at that time, that only two are here mentioned. I have often wondered that an argument so very weak and inconclusive, should ever have been urged or suggested

* Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church claim no other authority than was given to Timothy and Titus, and by them exercised.

at all. For supposing there were at that time, in that one place, but two grades of Ministers, is this any proof that there were but two in the Church? Was not Paul himself, who wrote the Epistle, of a higher grade? We must, in reason, suppose that several years elapsed before those we now call Bishops, such as Titus and Timothy, were placed over all the Churches which the Apostles planted. For more than fifty years after a number of Episcopal Churches were established in this country, they had in them but one Order of Ministers. The British government, through fear of offending those called Dissenters, would not allow us to have a Bishop here. Our candidates, who crossed the Atlantic for Orders, were ordained both Deacons and Elders, or Priests, before they returned. Now suppose that some one, five hundred years hence, should, from this fact, pretend to prove that Episcopalians of this country, in the eighteenth century, did not consider more than one Order of Ministers necessary; would not such reasoning be very fallacious? Not more so, however, than this from Paul's addressing only Bishops and Deacons at Philippi. The Apostles, at first, had all the Churches under their care, and they placed in them, no doubt, one, or two, or three of the grades of Ministers, according as they had need, and as circumstances would admit. The traveling Apostles had the more immediate care of the Churches, till they could find suitable persons for such Episcopal charge. Such might be the case of the Church at Philippi, when Paul wrote the Epistle; and if such was the fact, it does not, in the least degree, militate against the Episcopal regimen.

But it is by no means clear and certain that St. Paul, in this Epistle, speaks only of two Orders in the Church at Philippi: to me it is evident, that he speaks of three. It is affirmed by some early writers, that Epaphroditus was the Apostle or ruling Bishop at Philippi, and that, at the time of writing this Epistle, he was with Paul. And this, the Epistle itself confirms. You may see in the latter part of the fourth chapter, that several times the Philippians had sent presents to Paul, which, with much thankfulness, he acknowledges. It appears that they made a liberal collection for the Apostle, and sent it by their chief Minister. "I have all," says St. Paul, "and abound; I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you; an odor of a sweet smell; a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." It was customary then to send such charitable collections by an Apostle or presiding Bishop. That this messenger was of that grade, we have in the second chapter direct proof: "I supposed it necessary," says the Apostle, "to send to you Epaphroditus, my

brother and *companion in labor*, and fellow soldier, but *your Apostle*." So it is in the Greek. In our English Testament it is rendered "messenger," but it ought to be "Apostle," according to the Scriptural use of the word. And, therefore, with much fitness St. Paul acknowledges him as his *brother*, his *companion in labor, and fellow-soldier*, evidently implying that he was a Minister of Christ, of the same grade as himself: a *messenger* sent from God. And what still further confirms this, in the last chapter the Apostle apostrophizes him in these words: "I entreat THEE, also, true yoke-fellow, help those women who labored with me in the Gospel." Now had there not been one in that Church eminently distinguished above the Bishops and Deacons, by some dignity or Office, there could have been no propriety in this apostrophe, nor could the Church have known who was meant. The Epistle was not directed to Epaphroditus, because he was the person who carried it, as we read in the postcript; yet as he would be present when the Epistle was opened, it was natural, and very fitting, that the Apostle should address him in this affectionate manner, as his true yoke-fellow, his companion in labor, and fellow-soldier, in a sense in which the Elders and Deacons were not so. It is, therefore, much more than probable—to me it is very evident—that Epaphroditus had Apostolic authority, and that there were, at that time, the three Orders of Ministers at Philippi.

But the passage of the Scriptures, which is chiefly relied upon by those who are opposed to Episcopacy, is in the 1st Epistle to Timothy, iv. 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." But few words will be necessary to show that all the argument from this passage is from the mere sound of the word *presbytery*. There is no proof from the Scriptures, nor from ancient writers, that this word was used in the Apostles' days, as it is in modern times, for a number of presbyters. Irenæus, who was born before the death of St. John, styles the Apostles the "presbytery of the whole Christian Church." In their own writings the Apostles are sometimes called Presbyters, and it is most probable that a Presbytery then was a college of the Apostles; and that several of them were present, and assisted at the ordination of Timothy. Of one thing we are very certain, that he was ordained *by an Apostle*. St. Paul will best explain his own meaning. In his 2d Epistle to Timothy, i. 6, he writes, "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." Now though people choose to insist that Timothy was ordained *by* the presbytery, which is not said,

they must allow that *one*, at least, of the presbytery was *an Apostle* You see, too, that Paul was the ordainer; the gift was conveyed *by* the laying on of *his* hands, and *with* the laying on of the hands of the others. Exactly in the same way do we ordain still; one Bishop is always the ordainer; *by* him the commission is conveyed, and it is done *with* the cōoperation of the others present, who lay on their hands at the same time. This passage, therefore, if we regard the sense of the words, as explained by the Apostle himself, far from disproving Episcopacy, very much confirms it.

Another passage urged against Episcopacy is in St. Paul's address to the Elders of Ephesus, Acts xx. 28: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you *overseers*," or, as it is in the Greek, *Bishops*. But this proves nothing to the purpose; I have already shown, what all allow, that Elders in the Apostles' days, were called Bishops. And let me repeat, that we contend not for *names* but *things;* the question is, whether there were different grades of Ministers in the Church? We contend that there is no manner of proof from the Scriptures, nor from any early writers of the Church, that Ordination was *ever* performed by any but the Apostles, and those who were their successors in Office. All the account we have in the Scriptures of the Ordination of Deacons, was by the Apostles and by Timothy.

In the 13th chapter of the Acts, we read, that while certain *prophets* and *teachers* "ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed." Some think that this was an Ordination of two Apostles, by those who were prophets and teachers. But several circumstances show that this could not be an Ordination, but merely a solemn ceremony and benediction in setting them apart to particular work. For first, Barnabas and Saul are themselves numbered with those *prophets* and *teachers* who were ministering to the Lord; and it is absurd to suppose that prophets and teachers should ordain those who were already of the same order as themselves. Secondly, and what is still more important, St. Paul is very particular in declaring and proving that he did not receive his Apostleship from *men;* that he was sent by Christ himself, who appeared to him for that purpose; and that he commenced preaching the Gospel, long before he had any communication with them who were Apostles before him. And, thirdly, he had been at that time actually executing the

Office of an Apostle, probably for six or eight years. Who, then, will believe, that, contrary to his own positive declaration, and after he had been for several years preaching the Gospel, he was ordained to the Ministry by men!

Some have reasoned in a different way against Episcopacy; they say that Christ gave to His Apostles one commission only, and that, in ordaining others, they had no right to divide, or convey but a part of it; that they must convey the whole or none, and, of course, that all Ministers of Christ are of one grade, and have equal authority. This is changing the ground entirely. Those, before spoken of, deny that any, after the first Apostles, had the same Office; but these, on the contrary, maintain, that "all are Apostles." In answer to this argument, it is enough, and more than enough to remind you, that Christ after He had elected the Twelve, and named them Apostles, gave them additional power, and sent them to preach and baptize; and again after His resurrection, gave them, in full, the Apostolic commission. He also ordained seventy with less power. At their last ordination, He sent the Apostles as He had been sent; and, of course, they were to follow His example, in bestowing different grades of Office on those whom they ordained. It was natural that they should, and it was evidently their duty to give Holy Orders, as they had themselves received them, to follow the example of their divine Master. And this they actually did; under their ministrations were different grades, and we cannot reasonably doubt but that the Apostles, and their successors in Office, ordained them. St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "God hath set some in the Church, first, Apostles, secondarily, prophets, thirdly, teachers:" and adds, "Are all Apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?" If God has set three orders in the Church, I know not who is authorized to reduce them to one; or to say that "all are Apostles," having equal authority; or all prophets or Presbyters. Can we believe that the Deacons and the Bishops or Elders ordained by Timothy were of the same grade? It is the united voice of all antiquity, that Deacons have a part, and the lowest part of the Christian Ministry. The qualifications required for the Office are essentially the same as for presbyters. In speaking of their qualifications, St. Paul observes, in conclusion, "They that have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good *degree*;" thus more than intimating that the Deacons, who are faithful in that lower Office, are entitled to advancement to a higher grade in the Ministry.

That the Elders, in the Apostles' days called also Bishops, were a distinct order, no one denies. And that Timothy and Titus were of a

higher grade, and had jurisdiction over the Elders and Deacons, and the power to ordain them—the same, indeed, as that which we now call Episcopal authority—seems to me too evident to admit of a doubt.

It is often *affirmed*, but has never been *proved*, that the Ministers of Christ were at first all of one grade, and that the Bishops usurped the authority, which it is acknowledged, they in the early ages possessed. But this is absurd, and altogether incredible. It is absurd to suppose that those now called Bishops, made such a change. Because, if the government of the Church was left by the Apostles in the hands of Presbyters, *they*, the Presbyters, must have made the change.* On this supposition there were no Bishops to abuse power; *the Presbyters usurped authority and made the change.* If a thing so strange and so wicked was done at all, it was done by Presbyterians or Congregationalists. They who advance this position virtually say, that within one or two centuries at most, after the government was put into their hands, they *all*, in *every* country, agreed in changing it to what Christ never intended. They certainly do very little honor to that mode of Church government, by supposing it so defective and inefficient as to be so soon relinquished.

It must, too, be difficult for us to believe, that, in the first three centuries, men should have been *ambitious* of the Episcopate, when its worldly advantages were so small, and its sacrifices and perils so great. *Martyrdom, in those ages, might almost be considered as annexed to a Bishopric.* The general practice of the persecutor was to *smite the shepherd that the sheep might be scattered;* the Bishop was usually the first led to tortures and to death. How can we, in reason, believe that, under such circumstances, so great a change should be made in the government of the Church? that the holy martyrs of that time which truly "tried men's souls," should attempt, or desire to alter the Institutions of Christ? *And had such a change by some Churches been attempted, it seems morally impossible that it should have become general.* And yet we are sure, from all ancient history, that *Episcopacy was general from a very early period down to the Reformation.* During the first fifteen centuries, it is not easy to name any one part of Christianity, in which *all* Christians were more generally united than in what we now call Episcopacy. Heretics even—they who were separated from the orthodox Christians—still retained the three Orders of the Ministry. All those sects of anti-Trinitari-

* See a sermon by the author, on 1 Peter iii. 15, published in the Gospel Advocate.

ans, of various Creeds and denominations, who are now included under the general name of Unitarians, then had their Bishops. No others pretended to ordain. And down to this present time, no ancient Church has been found, or can be named, that is or has been without the Episcopal government. Can you indeed believe, that in the purest ages of the Church, the disciples of Christ, when cruelly persecuted, and ready to endure agonies and death for His sake, would all agree in changing the government of His Church? *Such a change, so silent, so peaceable, and so general, without opposition, or any historical record, is a moral impossibility.*

I have dwelt longer on this subject than I intended. Being about, the Lord permitting, to advance one to a higher grade in this Ministry, I thought it might be satisfactory, and I hope not unprofitable, to the people present, to show briefly by what authority we do this, and who has given us this authority. Should there be any here who think differently on this point, they will not, I trust, regret having *heard what we think* on a subject which so much concerns us all. Nothing will tend more to unite Christians in love, than candidly hearing from each other the hope that is in them. And, indeed, if differing denominations of Christians are ever brought to *strive together for the Faith of the Gospel*, it will be by their first uniting in *the Government*, (whatever they may decide it to be,) which *God has set in His Church.*

Much cause have we to bless God, that His promise of a Christian Ministry has not failed; that these streams of His mercy have descended to us, and are watering this, our favored country. Through His goodness, we are now here assembled for the interesting purpose of solemnly advancing to the Order of the Priesthood, *one* who, as we trust, "*has* executed the office of a *Deacon* well, and purchased to *himself*" this higher *degree* in the sacred Ministry. On occasions like this, did the primitive Christians fast and pray. With earnest solicitude and deep humiliation, they besought God to pour His Spirit upon those who were appointed to this Office and ministration. Did we duly reflect upon it, how momentous would appear the work which our hands now find to do! a work which so much concerns the honor of our Saviour, the prosperity of His Church, and the salvation of, we know not how many, immortal souls.

Art. IV.—THE MORAVIANS.

1.—*The Fourth Centennial Anniversary of the Mo Church, Philadelphia,* 1857. 12mo.

2.—*The Moravian Manual.* By E. de Schweinitz, Pa the Franklin street Moravian Church, Philadelphia. delphia, Lindsay & Blakiston, Publishers, 1859. pp 12mo.

3.—*Acta Fratrum Unitatis in Anglia.* London. Prin the year MDCCXLIX. 4to., pp. 156.

4.—*A Memorial of the Dedication of Monuments erec the Moravian Historical Society, to mark the sites c cient Missionary Stations in New York and Conne* New York, C. B. Richardson, Office of the Historical zine, 348 Broadway. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott 1860. 8vo., pp. 185.

The Moravians are most familiarly and extensively kn their missionary character. As faithful, indefatigable an cessful pioneers in the great work of Christian Missions heathen nations, "their sound has gone out into all the e In this respect, no body of men since Apostolic tim achieved a more honorable, or a more extensive reputati all the rare and admirable qualities which such a work re No zeal, no patience, no perseverance, no genuine Ch faith has ever exceeded that which has been constantly e ted on the Moravian fields of labor, and in connection wi various Moravian Missions. No more earnest spirit of self tion and self-denial; no more faithful and patient labor all circumstances of difficulty and danger; no more pr and unreserved self-dedication in Christian faith and l the noble effort of preaching the Gospel, "to those wh sitting in darkness, and in the region and shadow of d has the world ever seen, than has been constantly wit

for more than a hundred years last past, in the Moravian Missions in Greenland, in Labrador, in the West Indies, in South America, in Africa, in Russia, and among the savage tribes of North America.

These Missions have been distinguished from all other Protestant Missions by the simple faith and direct energy by which they have been characterized, by the direct and successful appeal which they seemed able to make to the ignorant heathen mind, by the singular combination of sound instruction with a simple yet earnest piety, which they have everywhere promoted, and by the wonderful success with which, even in the hardest and most forbidding fields, they have almost ever been attended. What a sublime act of Christian zeal, piety, and devotion, was the offer which was made by those first Moravian missionaries, Leonard Dober and Tobias Leupold, to the planters of the Island of St. Thomas, to sell themselves for slaves that they might be permitted to preach the Gospel to those who were bound in the shackles of slavery! What an effort of Christian heroism to plant the Gospel in the inhospitable clime of Greenland, where the persistent Dane (Hans Egede,) had been fruitlessly laboring for fifteen years! And how noble the design, in spite of all remonstrances, and all representations of the folly and danger of attempting to Christianize and civilize the savage tribes of this continent, still to persist in their settled conviction that it could and would be done, that it ought to be attempted; and that, if rightly prosecuted, it would not fail!

The marvellous success of the Moravians in all these, the first beginnings of their efforts, together with their wonderful subsequent history, no less remarkable, and no less distinguished by those peculiar features of their first Missions, have given them a name and a fame which might well be envied, and which can hardly fail to pass, forever honored and revered, down the current of time.

The Moravian history is one of the most striking and instructive, among the more remarkable phenomena of modern times. It is especially so, because, unlike all those Protestant bodies who ventured to sacrifice the primitive constitution, it

presents a noble example of a thoroughly Protestant community, which, under the strongest temptations, and the most difficult circumstances, has ever cautiously maintained its original integrity, has ever persistently prosecuted the noble work upon which from the first it entered; has ever faithfully preserved its unity, and seems at this day, to be nobly preparing itself for a still higher destiny, for a grander and more expansive work in the future, and for an advancing sphere of usefulness and Christian conquest in the coming time. For all this the past has only prepared the way, and has demonstrated the existence of an inherent vitality and power, equal to the greatest emergencies, and capable of realizing the highest purposes and ends.

It is a striking fact of Moravian history, that the remarkable missionary work to which we have just now referred, was first entered upon, and has been constantly prosecuted, expressly in grateful recognition of what the Moravians regard as a special providence, in the restoration and renewal, to a people scattered and dispersed, and rapidly dwindling to decay, of the primitive institution and organization. What is commonly understood to have been their origin as a sect, was in fact but a restoration and revival of that which had existed, and was more or less known and recognized through long ages of persecution and trial from primitive times. That the Unitas Fratrum is not a mere temporary Sect, the creature of a day, "coming up in a night and perishing in a night," might easily and unmistakably be concluded from the thorough character of its teaching; from the firm grasp with which it seizes all the great dogmas of the Christian Faith, and from the direct and unflinching manner in which it applies dogmatic truth to the sound development of the Christian life; from the earnestness and faithfulness with which it preaches Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and combines with this faithful subjective teaching, the necessity of the Sacraments, as means of spiritual grace, and pledges of spiritual benefits. These varied elements of doctrine, which in all sectarian systems seem to appear as *opposites*, and develope themselves in destructive antagonisms, can only be thoroughly incorporated

and harmonized by a Catholic and Apostolic Church, whose inherent instinct it is to span the whole circle of truth, to grasp the whole full orb of Divine Revelation.

The voice of history teaches us that this vast advantage is seldom or never possessed by any body of men, who cannot demonstrate, as a matter of historical fact, their Apostolic origin. The heritage of the past, seems to have been designed by Divine Providence, as a security for the present, and a pledge for the future. The Faith was committed to the Church as a deposit, which will only be preserved and duly valued while its history is known and its continuity preserved. It is of its essence that it was *once delivered to the saints.* It was its highest and best guaranty, that Christ would be with those who published it, in its integrity, always, "even unto the end of the world."

It is not strange, then, that those who deny or forget that they have a deposit, of which they are only the witnesses and keepers, should speedily let it slip; that more temporary and more attractive, but less important matters, should insensibly take its place; and that they who began by undervaluing or despising the casket, in which the precious jewel of spiritual truth was designed to be preserved, should end in casting away the jewel itself, as of little or no value. Thus it can hardly happen that they have an Apostolic Constitution who, as a body, lay no claim to it. They who have been sufficiently careful to retain it, are not likely to be insensible to its value. And if once it come to this, that the claim is yielded, it would be presumptive proof, that the fact no longer existed, and that the body itself which had laid aside the claim, had done it from want of confidence in any historical basis on which it could be made to rest. And, on the other hand, it affords a strong presumption in favor of the integrity of such a historical claim, if, as in the case of the United Brethren, it has been persisted in, from generation to generation, and from age to age.

Even though a constant succession of names and dates should not be exhibited; even though long gaps should occur in the history, which are bridged over by no positive records, save the

constant tradition of the perpetuity of such an institution; even though the history of the times only gives us a sad account of the persecutions, and trials, and sufferings, of those who have witnessed, in evil times, for the truths and ordinances of God; yet, on general grounds, such a claim constantly affirmed, cannot justly be rejected, but its validity and integrity must be presumed until it is disproved, and on positive evidence denied.

But for the Unitas Fratrum this apology is not at all necessary. For, with the Moravians, the Apostolic Episcopacy has ever been religiously and faithfully preserved and maintained. The line of Apostolic descent is clear and tangible; a matter of constant historical record. And in all the darkest periods of their history, it has always been the final resort, the tower of refuge, the bulwark of strength, as the ultimate bond of union, with the other more powerful branches of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ.

It would be the merest folly to dispute, as some have affected to do, the Moravian claim to the Episcopacy, at any period previous to the Lutheran Reformation; and, for the simple reason, that up to that period, none but an Episcopal Church can be proved to have ever existed. Concerning even the Waldenses, there is no ground of controversy up to that period. Up to that time, without all doubt, even those of France and Italy had a valid Episcopacy, which was only subverted afterwards by the stress of the times.

The Unitas Fratrum, which was flourishing in spite of violent persecution in Bohemia and Moravia, when Luther commenced his contest with the Church of Rome, had come down with a perfect organization and a thorough discipline from the more ancient times. About the year 1500, they had more than two hundred Churches in Bohemia and Moravia; were zealously engaged in preaching the Gospel, and were diligently using the Press for the furtherance of evangelical truth, and had already printed and published a Bohemian Version of the Bible. Three editions of the Bohemian Bible had already been published before the Printing Press had as yet been employed for this purpose by any other hands. And the Unitas Fratrum

had existed as an independent and fully organized Reformed Church, full fifty years before the dawn of the Lutheran Reformation!

As to its organization and fundamental principles, it had received the sanction both of the Greek and Latin Churches, recognized and approved by, as well as originally derived from the one,* but evermore jealously watched and persecuted by the other; and persecuted, not as lacking the Primitive Constitution of the Christian Church, but as inflexibly and irreconcilably hostile to the prevalent ignorance, corruption, and tyranny of Rome. Its existing organization, as indicated by the name of Unitas Fratrum, was the fruit of a reunion of the scattered remnants of Calixtines and Taborites after the famous Hussite war, which had distracted those countries for thirty long years.

Indeed the first and greatest battles of the dawning Reformation, were fought in Bohemia, and Moravia, and Poland. There, where the Greek and Roman Churches came directly in contact with each other, and brought to bear upon a border population, their respective, and in many respects, contradictory influence; there, among a vigorous and hardy race, who had been converted by the Greeks from heathenism, while as yet the controversy raged in its greatest violence, which soon afterwards terminated in the great and incurable schism between the East and the West; there, where dwelt the last of the nations, who in those disastrous times, were taught to lisp their new born Faith in their own mother tongue, who had scarcely known the Gospel before they were called to contend unto blood, for their very birthright, in the Scriptures of truth, who had but just been taught the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, when they were assailed by the strongest and most relentless of all anti-Christian powers, and persecuted with the terrible alternative of recantation or death, was planted a seed which, thoug'i once and again ruthlessly trampled into dust, and merciless y driven through and through with the plowshare of destruction, has never yet been entirely rooted

* Acta Fratrum, &c. Page 48.

up. As often as it has fallen, it has ultimately risen again to a new and vigorous life; and now, after long ages of suffering and of peril, finds itself in a position, powerful to achieve a glorious name in the mighty Christian conflicts of the coming time.

There were reasons not easily understood in later times, why the writings of Wickliffe, so nearly crushed out, and annihilated in England, where they were first published, should have produced such noble fruits in Bohemia and Moravia, whither many of the Wickliffites were driven by the jealous power of Rome. For there they found a congenial soil. There they found a people of a lofty and generous spirit, who though they had for ages been persecuted, had never yet been enslaved; a people who hated Rome alike for its persecutions, and for its corruptions; who were near enough the Greeks to borrow something of their light, and the almost inaccessible rocks and fastnesses of whose wild and beautiful country furnished at least a temporary refuge and shelter, whenever the prevailing tempest of persecution threatened their entire destruction. John Huss and Jerome of Prague, those blessed martyrs of the true Christian Faith, and noble witnesses against the errors and corruptions of Rome, were the representatives of a mighty tide of Reformation, which received its most powerful impulse from the writings of Wickliffe, and which rolled on with irresistible power through the whole period of the fifteenth century, until it finally forced upon the Papacy the suicidal dogmas of Trent, and laid the foundation of a Reformation, which shall, without all doubt, finally result in the full establishment of Primitive Christian truth, and its ultimate promulgation to all the ends of the earth.

As yet, the Unitas Fratrum had not approached its period of greatest peril. While standing firmly and independently upon its original platform, and contending alone against the abuses and errors of Rome, its position was one of comparative safety. But when the rushing tide of Reformation began to meet the opposing power, which it had so thoroughly roused, and when many of its less firm, but more ardent votaries began to despair of its success, unless in the abandonment of Primi-

tive Order, and Primitive Institutions; when even Luther and Calvin, with their respective disciples, had reluctantly resolved, in the stress of the times, to make this sacrifice of Apostolic Order, and at the same time, vehemently sought the countenance and support of all who sympathized with them, in the Protestant cause: then was brought to the severest test the inflexible integrity of those noble Moravians, who had successfully, on the ground of their Primitive Constitution, fought many a desperate battle with Rome, and though often contending unto death, had never failed in the end to gain the victory.

It is a most instructive page of Christian history. Here first arose the temptation, for the sake of *Christian Unity*, deliberately to sacrifice fundamental Christian Truth; and this upon a point, not of theological dogma, but upon what is often of much greater importance, *an organic principle of spiritual life.* The Episcopal Succession of the Moravians was derived from the Waldensian Bishop, Stephen, and his associates, in 1467. Previous to the request of consecration from his hands, a careful and minute inquiry was instituted into the history, and consequent validity of the Waldensian Episcopacy, as it then existed, and its derivation from the Sclavonian branch of the Greek or Eastern Church fully established and confirmed. The first attempt at re-organization had already been made, under circumstances of great trial and difficulty, ten years previous, in 1457. It was then hoped that Rokyzan, the celebrated Archbishop of Prague, would take the lead of the movement, and so the Episcopacy be derived from that source. But Rokyzan proved to be of a weak and vacillating character, unequal to such an emergency, and so disappointed their hopes. The union, however, cemented at that time, has ever been regarded as of the greatest importance. The four hundredth anniversary of that event was universally commemorated by the Moravians on March 1st, 1857. And the interesting volume placed at the head of this Article, entitled the "Fourth Centennial Anniversary of the Moravian Church," is made up of three Sermons, preached in the first Moravian Church in Philadelphia, on that occasion. Most

appropriately one of those sermons was by an honored Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Very significantly, but less suitably, another was by a clergyman of a prominent Presbyterian body, who, however heartily he might sympathize with the dogmatic teaching, would hardly be supposed to fraternize with the primitive organization of the Unitas Fratrum.

After their failure with Rokyzan, the faith and patience of the Brethren never wearied, until they established a full and perfect organization, in the consecration, by Stephen and his associates, of three of their number, of whom Michael Bradacius was one, to the Episcopate, an event worthy to be remembered and honored along with the consecration, nearly a hundred years afterwards, of Archbishop Parker, at Lambeth, in England, in 1559; of Bishop Seabury, in Scotland, in 1784; and of Bishop White and Bishop Provoost, in England, in 1787.

From 1467 onward, until the commencement of the Reformation in England, and generally on the Continent, the course of the Unitas Fratrum was, in spite of severe persecution, one of comparative prosperity and happiness. Its penetrating influence leavened the whole corrupting mass of European society. It kindled a flame which, in its outburst upon the Apocalyptic Beast, seemed to inflict a deadly wound; a wound which would indeed have proved deadly and incurable, if the Lutheran and Calvinistic, like the Moravian and English Churches, had been sufficiently careful to guard their deposit of Faith, with the organic Unity of the Apostolic Constitution, and the imperishable bond of the primitive Order.

And, for the succeeding fifty years, it still continued to flourish. But it suffered the constant enervation and depletion of the oft repeated attempt of a considerable portion of their number, for the sake of unity, to amalgamate with those whose ecclesiastical organization was fundamentally defective; and with whom they could not be thoroughly incorporated, without either absorbing them, or being absorbed by them. The extreme violence of persecution, producing mutual sympathy among the various Protestant bodies, hastened on the dangerous crisis.

And the ancient Unitas Fratrum was well nigh ruined as an active independent organization, by what was doubtless regarded as a great triumph on the part of most of those engaged in it, in 1570, by the "Union of Sendomir," a sort of Evangelical Alliance, embracing the Brethren, the Lutherans, and the Reformed.

In this Union, however, it was expressly stipulated by the Brethren, that the Episcopal Succession and Discipline should be fully retained. To this arrangement the Reformed readily assented.* But the Lutherans objected; and finally, after a long period of altercation and dissatisfaction, they withdrew, carrying with them as the stronger body in numbers, a large portion of the numerical strength and social influence which the Brethren had contributed to that treacherous cause.

It was this delusive "Union of Sendomir," to which, in after times, the noble Comenius, a name ever to be honored and revered, traced its subsequent downfall and threatened ruin. For many years afterwards, however, its apparent prosperity continued, while it was in favor with the civil authorities, who aided to keep at bay the blood thirsty emissaries of Rome. But there was a worm at the root. When the flame of persecution again was kindled, it swept over the countries of Bohemia and Moravia like a flood, and in 1627, at the close of that fearful Anti-Reformation, only a scattered remnant, doubtless many more than there seemed to be, was left, and that chiefly in Poland; a precious remnant indeed, who now valued above all price that which before they had been but too willing to compromise, and who now longed and prayed with intense earnestness, for its restoration, in its original integrity and purity.

At the last named period, John Amos Comenius, before referred to, was thirty-five years of age, having been born in 1592, a profound scholar, a wise and holy man. "That brave old man," and "the incomparable Moravian," as Cotton Mather in his *Magnalia* calls him, "who in 1654 agreed withal by our Mr. Winthrop," to become the President of "Harvard College, in America."† To him is due the principal honor of the

*Crantz Hist. of the United Breth., p. 56. †*Mather's Magnalia*, Vol. II, p. 16.

final restoration of the Moravians to their ancient heritage. Banished from his native country, with the feeble remnant of his Brethren, and having climbed the heights of the Moravian hills overlooking the home of his affections and his hopes, he threw himself, in profound sadness and sorrow, upon his knees, and prayed most fervently, with strong cries and tears, that God would not quite remove His Word from his native land; but would preserve to Himself therein an inheritance and a name to the future generations of men.

And those fervent prayers were in due time answered. In 1632, Comenius himself was consecrated a Bishop of the scattered and fugitive flock. And he set himself, henceforth, with pious and indefatigable energy, to gather them into the ancient, but now nearly desolate fold. And to this end, he made unceasing appeals to all the Protestant powers of Europe, and especially to the Church and Government of England, in their behalf. It was chiefly in England, that his appeals met with decided encouragement and success. And hence he was emboldened, in the dedication of his history of the Bohemian and Moravian Churches, to commit his brethren to the charitable care of the Church of England. Addressing the English Church, he says, "We commend to you, our beloved Mother, the Brethren's Church, that you may take care of her, whatever it may please God to do—whether to restore her in her native land, or, when deceased there, to revive her elsewhere."*

While the eloquent and persuasive voice of Comenius was ringing in their ears, it could not well be forgotten by those interested in the Protestant cause, nor yet by its enemies, that there still lived a vigorous remnant of the ancient Protestant Church of Moravia. And the earnestness of his faith could not but have impressed itself upon their minds, as an infallible pledge of a glorious future blessing. In every possible way, by his preaching, and by publishing books, setting forth the doctrines and principles of the Ancient Church, he prepared the way for its ultimate renewal. In 1662, "in hope against hope," he took direct measures for the continuity of the Epis-

* Holmes' Hist. of the United Breth. Vol. I. p. 131.

copacy, from Martin Gertich, and John Buettner, of the Polish line,* until, in 1735, it was transferred, by Daniel E. Jablonsky, and Christian Sitkov, to David Nitschman, and afterwards, in 1737, to the illustrious Count Zinzendorff, the providential instrument of the final renewal and restoration of the Church. The venerable Bishop Comenius, the last of the Bohemian Moravian line, closed his eventful career in 1671, in the seventy-ninth year of his age, still hoping for the restoration of the Unitas Fratrum.

Such, briefly, is the ancient history of the Moravians, antecedent to the time since which they are commonly known to have a history. It is clearly shown to be the history, militant indeed, of a truly Catholic and Apostolic Church. All objections which have ever been brought against it, in this behalf, have been mainly founded upon the practice to which we have already referred, of fraternizing, in sacred Offices, with those who could lay no claim to an Apostolic Ministry. By this false charity, indeed, it has again and again been well nigh ruined, and it is even now the snare into which it is most likely to fall, as it is the principal obstacle in the way of its future prosperity and success. Yet, in every instance, as we have seen in the case of the "Union of Sendomir," it was uniformly stipulated, and insisted on, by the Brethren, that nothing should be required on their part, which should, in the slightest degree, involve the sacrifice of the Episcopal Succession. Jurisdiction was, at times, waived, or shared with others. But the strictly Episcopal Office and prerogatives, were jealously and religiously guarded and preserved. Ordinations, especially, were always reserved exclusively to the Bishops, and always, except in very rare and extraordinary cases, not affecting the transmission of the ordaining power, by the Apostolic mode of laying on of hands; the proofs of which are abundant, and beyond all cavil, to the mind of every intelligent and impartial historian.†

* The intervening names in the line of succession are Peter Jablonsky, Adam Samuel Hartman, John Zugehoer, Joachim Gulich, John Jacobides.—*Moravian Manual*, p. 131.

† The precise position which the Episcopacy occupies among the United Brethren, will be seen by refering to the Moravian Manual. It says:

Thus, within their own Communion, the Episcopal Succession has always been strictly guarded. Their integrity, in this respect, sustained the rigid scrutiny of Archbishop Potter, and Sherlock, Bishop of London, and all the heads of the Church of England, about the middle of the last century. The Act of Parliament of 1747, and the more special Act of 1749, in favor of the United Brethren, were the immediate result of this scrutiny, in which it is declared, that the Moravian congregations "were an antient Episcopal Church, which had been countenanced and relieved by the Kings of England." The Archbishop had also previously, in 1737, made a declaration to a committee "of the associates of the late Dr. Bray," with a view to their employment in the Missionary work of that society. "That the Moravian Brethren were an Apostolical and Episcopal Church, not sustaining any doctrines repugnant to the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England,*" as a consequence of which, they were employed by that society, and sent with Ingham, and the Wesleys, to instruct the negroes in Georgia and South Carolina. This, however, was but an ex-

"The orders in the ministry of the Moravian United Brethren's Church, are derived from the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, and are those of *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*.

1st. Our Episcopacy, in itself, gives to the individual who holds it no title to a share in the government of the Brethren's Church, or of any individual congregation.

2d. No Bishop is, as such, subordinate to another.

3d. A Bishop has no Diocese committed to his jurisdiction.

4th. A Bishop, like every other servant of the Unity, must receive a special appointment to any office which he holds, from the Synod, or the Unity's Elders, Conference, or a Provincial Elders' Conference.

5th. Ordination to the different church-degrees can be performed only by virtue of an express commission from the above mentioned authorities.

The prerogatives belonging to the Bishops, in virtue of their office, are—

1st. *They only can ordain to the three Orders in the Ministry.*

2d. They have a seat and vote in the General Synod.

3d. They have a seat and vote in the Provincial Synods of the respective Provinces in which they reside.

At the same time, however, Bishops are, almost invariably, by election or appointment, connected with the government of the Church, both in the Provinces, and so far as the Unity at large is concerned."—*Moravian Manual*, Chap. v. pp. 125—6.

* *Acta Fratrum*, &c., p. 7. Appendix, p. 11.

pression of the general sentiment, and public action of the Church of England, constantly, from the beginning of the Reformation. For example, under King Edward VI. in 1557, John A. Lasco, a Moravian divine, afterwards a Bishop of the Brethren's Church, was appointed by the king, one of the thirty-two Commissioners, to examine, set forth, and correct the Ecclesiastical Laws of England. In 1683, in answer to the appeal of John Amos Comenius, an address was issued by Charles II. to the Church of England, on behalf of the Moravians, which was recommended by Archbishop Lancraft, and Henry Compton, Bishop of London, on the ground of its being "an antient Episcopal Church, which had been free from her infancy, for almost *seven hundred years*, from the encroachments of Rome, the heiress of the truly antient Faith.*" And in 1715, upon the representation of Archbishop Wake, and Dr. John Robinson, Bishop of London, and warmly encouraged by Fleetwood, Bishop of Ely, an Act of Parliament was passed for the relief of the Bohemian and Moravian Churches, as "*Protestant and Episcopal.*" And the Trustees appointed for the charity were the two Archbishops, the High Chancellor of England, and the Bishops of London, Carlisle, Sarum, Norwich, and Bristol.†

The argument for the Episcopacy has always been rested by the Moravians, as by the Church of England and by the American Church, mainly upon the evidence of historical fact. And at certain important periods of their history, the Episcopacy seems rather to have been retained through the providence of God, than through its conscious value and importance in the eyes of some of those to whom it was committed; and who were to act a prominent part in the Church of which it was a fundamental principle.

In private opinion, for example, Count Zinzendorff, who was educated a Lutheran, was opposed to the Episcopacy, and for a time earnestly contended that it should be laid aside, in order to facilitate the union of the Moravians with the Lutheran Church of the time. And he was only overruled and silenced

* *Acta Fratrum*, &c., p. 19. † *Acta Fratrum*, &c., p. 21. Appen., p. 41.

by the answer of a lot, which, as an oracle of God, dete mined in favor of the fugitive, but better instructed Brethre that they should "keep the traditions which had been commi ted to them."*

Happy will it be for the Moravians, if they shall learn practical lesson from their past history, in this behalf! Hap if, while the door is yet open before them, they shall consid and understand wherein their great strength lies! Happy, they will still remember, that their noblest and best memori consists in a blessed and glorious work, in which they ha been the active agents, but which was first entered upon, a has ever since been prosecuted, in grateful recognition of t providence of God, in restoring to them their ancient regime their Apostolic character, their Catholic organization, deriv from the primitive times! And happy, if they shall in d time realize that their best prospects for the future, cons in a firm and amicable alliance with the Anglo-Saxon Church of England and America, to whom, in the times of their dee est distress, their appeal has been always most confidently a successfully made; with whom, in all fundamental princip and doctrines, they have a thorough sympathy; by whom th Catholic and Apostolic character, if set in its proper light, a not *disclaimed by a contradictory practice*, would be again, it has often been, most cheerfully recognized, and who wou most joyfully bid them God speed, in the great missiona work in which they have a manifest divine vocation!

The position of the Moravian Church, in regard to the Ep copal Church in this country, is of course determined, un further action shall be had, by the action of the Church England in 1683, in 1715, in 1747, and in 1749; the Bishop London, who held the jurisdiction in the American Coloni as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury, giving his official s sent, and especially in 1749, when the action had especial r ference to the preaching of the Gospel on this continent.

From 1737 to 1747, a union between the Church of En land and the Moravians in this country, was contemplated

* Spangenberg's Life of Zinzendorff, p. 134.

both the Moravians and the Heads of the Church of England,* which was probably prevented by the rapid development of the Methodist schism. Nor would we advocate, at the present time, any attempt, on our part, at union with the Moravian Church, or their incorporation with us. For many reasons, it might be impracticable. But, we would suggest such a recognition and alliance as would enable the two bodies readily to act in concert: such an examination of our respective Rituals, on either hand, as shall make us better acquainted with each other; such an adjustment of their respective systems, as would prevent them from preying upon each other; and such an amicable understanding, as would admit an assignment to each, by mutual consent, of the proper field to which it is best adapted, and on which its greatest victories have heretofore been gained. To our "Memorialists," especially, we commend the subject, as one quite worthy of their attention.

The proper calling of the Moravians in this country, is, probably, for the most part, among the Germans; for influence with whom, by education, association, and historic origin, they are best fitted. And if so, this may prove the true solution of that most difficult of all problems, in this country, *the influence of the German element, and the moulding of the German mind.* This direction, the Moravians have already taken, and most of their new stations, which are now greatly increasing in numbers, are among the German immigrants.

We cannot but feel a deep interest in the Unitas Fratrum, in the present aspect of the Christian world. It has no compeer, as a Missionary Church, except the Church of England, with which, as we have seen, it has always had a kindly intercourse, and by which, in many instances, it has been very largely sustained. It has always had this advantage over the Church of England, and over the Church in this country, that it could always find men ready for its missionary work. Hence, the contributions of the Church of England have been mostly in money. And the annual contributions to the Moravian missionary work, from members of the Church of England, have

* Whitehead's Life of Charles Wesley, pp. 100, 101.

uniformly been exceedingly free and generous. With bot Clergy and Laity, it has ever been a popular charity. An in this country, though its work is limited, it has in a re markable degree taken hold of the public sentiment, wherev it has been known. Its schools at Bethlehem, and Nazareth, an Litiz, in Pennsylvania, and at Salem, in North Carolina, hav always been regarded as models, in the work of Christian edu cation, and to a much greater extent, than one would at fir imagine, have leavened the public sentiment throughout th whole country. Their pupils are found everywhere, throug out the land; and everywhere cherish the highest estimate the Moravian principles and character. And at this prese moment, as at all times since the settlement of this countr they are doing their wonted quiet, but vigorous work, with th utmost energy and power. The Moravian Church is, indee at present, in a transition state, the ultimate result of whi must be the independence of the American Province, of tho on the continent of Europe; its connection with which h heretofore checked its action, and its consequent prosperi and success. The organization of the Moravian Historical S ciety, and the erection of Monuments on the sites of the ear Missions of the Brethren in New York and Connecticut, a among the many indications of a fresh and vigorous life. An the filial affection with which the Moravians cherish the mem ories of the past, and the tenacity with which they cling the ancient Apostolic Institutions, and the generous zeal wi which they look forward upon the missionary work of the f ture, are genuine proofs of latent vitality and strength; a evident signs of a divine vocation in the gospel of Christ; a earnests of the prospective fulfilment to them of the Saviou promise to those first sent to do his work—*Lo! I am with y always, even to the end of the world.*

And if we turn to the ancient home of the Moravians—B hemia, Moravia, and Poland—which, since their expulsio about 1620, has ever been writhing under the spiteful and r lentless heel of Romish tyranny—and consider the openi prospects of those beautiful and fertile regions: if we remem ber the eighty thousand Moravians in the heart of Russia:

we consider, that the Moravians alone, with the exception of our own free and independent Church, are embarrassed with no entangling alliance of Church and State, that they are hampered by no long standing controversy, except the everlasting and essentially necessary controversy with Rome, the present position of the Moravian Church can hardly fail to be regarded as one of the most hopeful and interesting signs of the times.

---

*The Rev. Mr. De Schweinitz, in the "Memorial" named at the head of our Article, gives the following, as the present strength of the Moravian Church.

"The Moravian home Church, at the present time, consists of three Provinces, the American, Continental, and British—numbering together about twenty thousand souls. Of these, about eight thousand three hundred constitute the Church in the United States. These Provinces carry on the following operations: The American Province has thirty-nine preaching stations, and fourteen missionaries among the German immigrants of this country. The Continental Province is engaged in a very extensive domestic mission, among the state churches of the continent of Europe, employing one hundred and twenty male and female missionaries. About eighty thousand souls have been gathered, as the result of this mission; but not into full communion with the Moravian Church, since the purpose of the work is not to proselyte, but to *evangelize*. In the three Provinces, together, there are forty-four boarding schools belonging to the Church, as such, and managed by it. At these schools, about two thousand and fifty scholars are annually instructed, by three hundred and fifty-seven teachers. Four of these institutions are in the United States, having six hundred and fifteen pupils, and ninety-two teachers. The more particular statistics of the Foreign Mission work, are as follows. Adults baptized and confirmed, twenty thousand one hundred and ninety-three; adults baptized, eleven thousand four hundred and seventy-three; total of adults in church membership, thirty-one thousand six hundred and seventy; children baptized, twenty one thousand one hundred and forty-six; total in church fellowship by the sacrament of baptism, fifty three thousand five hundred and eighty-two; new converts and candidates for baptism, twenty thousand seven hundred and thirty-one; whole number of converts, seventy four thousand five hundred and thirty-eight: stations, seventy-four; missionaries, three hundred and twelve. Since the first commencement of this work, the Church has sent out two thousand and eighty-seven missionaries into heathen lands. Besides the fields now occupied, unsuccessful attempts were made, at various times, to establish missions in Lapland, among the Samoyedes, in Algiers, Ceylon, China, Persia, East Indies, Caucasus, and Demarara. In Guinea, Abyssinia, Tranquebar, and among the Calmucks, missions subsisted for a time, but had to be suspended. During the last twenty-five years, there has been an increase, in the foreign mission field, of thirty-two stations, one hundred and four missionaries and nearly thirty one thousand converts. The whole number of *foreign and home, or domestic missionaries*, at this time, is four hundred and forty-six. The whole number of souls connected with the *Unitas Fratrum*, is about one hundred and seventy five thousand."

Art. V.—ENGLISH REFORMATION: THE NAG'S-HEAD STORY.

1.—*P. F. Courayer's Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, &c.* 2 Vols. London, 1728.

2.—*The Validity of Anglican Ordinations, Examined &c.* By the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick. Philadelphia, 1841.

It is generally admitted that the Church of Rome has preserved an unbroken succession of Bishops, from the times of the blessed Apostles. Among all the charges which have been so justly urged against that corrupt branch of the Christian Church, no one has seriously raised a question as to the genuineness of her Episcopacy, or of her Ministry having descended through an unbroken succession of Episcopal Consecrators, from the very earliest times. The very tenacity with which the Primitive Church adhered to the maxim, "None but Bishops can ordain," as clearly appears in history, forbids the supposition of any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, having been created in any other way than by the laying on of hands, and prayer, of a Bishop, or Bishops. During the ages of mediæval darkness, this maxim was certainly not less regarded; and while morals and manners were sadly corrupted, and even the Faith endangered, to human appearances, on this,—the exclusive right of Bishops to perpetuate, at least their own Office —there was never but one opinion, in either the Eastern or Western Churches. Hence, any attempt to prove the Succession previous to the English Reformation, would be gratuitous and uncalled for.

In the mighty movement of the sixteenth century, however by which many great changes were wrought, and in the course of which the Continental Reformers seceded from the Church of Rome, and formally ignored the Episcopal Office, (in consequence of there being no Bishops concerned in the movement,) it is readily granted that there was, humanly speaking a possibility of some mis-step, by which the Succession might

be broken in England. True, the movement in England was unlike that of the Continent, as it was a *Reformation*, and not a secession. A large proportion of the English Bishops entered cheerfully into it, and freely put forth all their energies for its consummation; so that there was manifestly no *necessity* for any breach in the Succession. Nevertheless, in the confusion and turmoil of the times, there was certainly a liability to fall into irregularities; and but for the unflinching integrity of the great conservative minds of the age, which the providence of God had raised up for that peculiar work, there would have been a strong probability of fearful innovations. Happily for us, however, we are not called on to contemplate it in its incipiency, and to calculate probabilities. To us it is matter of *history*; and in the clear light of historic truth we are to examine it.

First of all, we must give a rapid sketch of the Reformation itself, from the commencement of the movement to the times when it was brought to so happy a consummation in the reign of Elizabeth.

Among the popular errors which have long passed without correction, and which the papists cunningly strive to perpetuate, is that which refers the whole movement of the Reformation to the private quarrel of Henry VIII. with the Pope, on the subject of his divorce from his first wife, Catharine, of Arragon. That this hastened the movement there can be no question; and that it was, under God, the proximate cause of the first open rupture between England and the Papal Court, is certain. But the spirit of the Reformation had long been slowly kindling in the heart of the English people;—even before its appearance in Germany or Switzerland. The popular sympathy evinced, both at home and abroad, in the labor and suffering of John Wickliff, who first translated the Scriptures into the English language, told with unerring certainty that the elements of a fearful commotion were even then working. The inner life of the Church, and the very humanity of an outraged Christendom, were rising in their might to throw off the incubus of superstition and corruption, which, for ages, had borne them down. In this state of things, the heroic and daring King Henry became but the spokesman of the general

mind of his times, when he boldly hurled defiance at the Papal Court, and refused longer to recognize its jurisdiction in England. In confirmation of what is here asserted, we quote from England's great historian, Hume. Speaking of the state of things in 1529, he says;

"The complaints against the usurpations of the ecclesiastics had been very ancient in England, as well as in most other European kingdoms; and as this topic had now become popular, everywhere, it had paved the way for the Lutheran tenets, and reconciled the people, in some measure, to the frightful idea of heresy and innovation. The commons, finding the occasion favorable, passed several bills restraining the impositions of the clergy; one for the regulating of monasteries; another against the exactions for the probates of wills; a third against non-residence and pluralities, and against churchmen being farmers of land. But what appeared chiefly dangerous to the ecclesiastical order, were the severe invectives thrown out, almost without opposition, in the house, against the dissolute lives of the priests; their ambition, their avarice, and their endless encroachments on the laity."

In short, the philosopher can hardly fail to read, in the Reformation, a natural out-cropping of the spirit of the times;—the breaking forth of a popular indignation, which had long been suppressed, but which had how acquired a degree of power that bade defiance to all restraints; and although the *Christian* may take yet higher grounds, and look on it as the unfolding of the deep designs of Providence, he cannot fail to embrace, in his view, the same working of proximate causes.

We have indulged in this digression for the purpose of showing that the Reformation resulted, not, as has been commonly asserted, from the private quarrel of King Henry, but from the operation of deep-seated causes which had been slowly, but certainly, tending to this result, for centuries.

In 1533, the decisive step was taken, which ultimately released the English Church from papal rule; and this was confessedly an act of Parliament, and of the Crown, rather than an ecclesiastical movement; though the evidence is conclusive that the movement met with a hearty response in the great mind of the English Church. Nay, the general regret was that the movement had not proceeded farther. For it does not appear that Henry had, at that time, nor in fact at any time, any serious objections to the teachings of the Romish

Church, so far as *doctrine* was concerned. *His* sole object seems to have been to throw off the papal *rule*. Hence, he contented himself with simply striking out of the Ordinal the Oath of obedience to the Pope, which all Bishops had been required to take, at the time of their Consecration. With this exception, all the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Romish Ritual were preserved. For the purpose of enforcing this change, a statute was enacted, that "No Bishop elect shall hunt after Bulls, or apostolical mandates from the Pope, concerning consecration; but only exhibit the royal mandate, by authority whereof, being ordained, (consecrated,) by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, according to act of parliament, and in imitation of the ancient canons, he shall be accepted as a true Bishop; nor shall any body otherwise ordained, (consecrated,) be acknowledged as such." By an additional statute, it was made imperative on the Archbishops and Bishops, whensoever the King's Patent should be addressed to them for the consecration of a Bishop, to proceed at once with the Office of consecration. Thus things remained until after the death of Henry VIII.

But after the accession of Edward VI. other and more important changes were introduced. In 1549, the Romish Ordinal was wholly abolished, and another form of Consecration set forth by Parliament, which was soon after embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. This has been censured by Romanists as an assumption of spiritual prerogatives by a secular body, which had no right to interfere in the affairs of the Church. The Ordinal, however, was not prepared by Parliament, but only ordered and set forth. The names of the men who drew up that instrument are preserved. Besides Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, there were six other Bishops, and six Doctors, (Presbyters.) The Bishops were Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, Holbech, of Lincoln, Day, of Chichester, Skip, of Hereford, Thirlby, of Westminister, and Ridley, of Rochester. The Doctors were Cox, May, Taylor, Heynes, Robertson, and Redmayne. No laymen were engaged in it. Neither the King nor Parliament attempted to specify the changes that should be made, but left it entirely to the piety and

goodly learning of these ecclesiastics, to make such changes as they thought requisite, and justified by the Ancient Canons. The new form was not even required to be submitted to the King, or Parliament, after it was arranged; but according to the act of Parliament, went into operation as soon as it was completed. These same men, also, drew up the reformed Liturgy entire. In 1552, when it had been used three years, Parliament directed this Ordinal to be annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, and set forth under its special endorsement.

On the death of Edward VI. and the accession of Queen Mary, of course all the changes under Henry and Edward were rescinded, and the Romish Ritual restored entire. Then, on the death of Mary, and the accession of Elizabeth, every thing was restored to the condition in which it had been left at the death of Edward. Her first Parliament, held in 1559, restored the Book of Common Prayer, entire, with the new Ordinal; and the Parliament of 1566 confirmed this act, and declared all Consecrations which had been performed within the past seven years, under the Ordinal, to be entirely legal. Thus, we have the highest possible testimony to their *legality*, according to the laws of the realm. Of course, their *validity* remains to be argued. With very slight alteration, this form of Consecration is still retained in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as well as of Scotland.

We come now to an important question: *Are the Consecrations of Archbishop Parker, and other Bishops consecrated under Elizabeth, to be regarded as valid?*

No calamity which has ever befallen the Church of Rome has caused her such intense mortification and chagrin, as did the English Reformation, by which her jurisdiction was formally disowned, and her many abuses exposed, and forever abandoned. Even then, England had shown unmistakable signs of her latent power, and given more than promise of the importance which she has since assumed among the nations of the earth. But England, the brightest jewel in the Papal crown, was now lost. The movement had not been of a violent or revolutionary character; it had been proceeding with slow and

steady pace through nearly five successive reigns, and had now culminated in so complete and orderly an establishment that there could be no reasonable hope of England ever soliciting a reconciliation to the bosom of the Papal Church. It was the more humiliating, from the fact that it had accomplished that for which it had set out;—a *Reformation*, and not a *revolution*, nor a secession. At the Continental Protestants, who had *seceded*, and of necessity abandoned Episcopacy, Rome could affect a sneer, and remind them that according to the Ancient Canons, and the universal customs of the Church of all ages, there could be no Church without Bishops, Priests and Deacons. But in England it was different. The same Church remained which had been there from A. D. 35, and the Romanists of England were the only seceders. Still, it was necessary to cover the disgrace by casting some reproach on the Reformed Church. For many years, no allegation was made, save that she was heretical, and in schism, not being in the embrace of the papacy. At length, when some years had elapsed since the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and when it was thought safe to raise questions of fact, Romish stories began to be set on foot concerning the consecration of the Elizabethan Bishops. Of course, it was readily granted, that unless Matthew Parker had been truly consecrated to the Office of Bishop, there must be a breach in the English succession, and hence, the English Church had lapsed into mere Presbyterianism.

The first objection urged was, that although Parker, and the other Bishops consecrated about the same time, had gone through the ceremony of Consecration, their Consecration was invalid, in consequence of William Barlow, one of the consecrating Bishops, having never, himself, been consecrated. This story was circulated by Romanists, soon after Parker's consecration. This, however, not being deemed very reliable, or sufficient for the purpose for which it was intended, after the lapse of about fifty years, another story was set in circulation, since known as the "Nag's-head Story;" and this, although it has been refuted by the documents, and other most reliable testimony, has been, at times, ever since, harped on by Romanists;—nor only by Romanists, but by some non-Episco-

pal Protestants, who have eagerly laid hold on any thing cal lated to throw discredit on the pretensions of the English Chu

The "Nag's-head Story," already alluded to, is thus gi by Dr. Champney, (a Romish priest,) in a book "On the cation of Bishops." It was published in English in 1616, in Latin, two years later:

"In the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Catholic Bishops b deposed and imprisoned, as shall be seen hereafter, others were to be ordai and substituted in their places. They who were nominated and elected to dignity met at London by appointment, at the sign of the Nag's head in Ch side; thither likewise, upon invitation, came the Bishop of Landaff, gr decrepid by reason of his age, and a simple timorous man, from whom the candidates expected consecration. But Bonner, Bishop of London, ther prison upon the account of religion, hearing of it, threatened Landaff with communication if he ordained them; who, being terrified by this message, perhaps, being inwardly touched with the stings of conscience, drew back, refused to lay his hands on them, alleging the weakness of his eyes as cause. The new candidates being thus deceived in their expectations, thinking themselves imposed upon, began to revile the old man, whom they before treated with a great deal of reverence and respect; some of them say 'This fool believes we cannot be made Bishops unless we are greased with ridiculing as well the old Bishop, as this Catholic custom of consecration. being thus deprived of a consecrator, they were forced to seek for a new exp ent; and they had recourse to Scory, an apostate monk, for their ordinat who, under Edward VI. had usurped a Bishoprick without any consecration shall be made to appear hereafter. This man, who had, together with his re ious habit, put off all conscience, soon performed what they desired, using ceremony:—They kneeling before him, and he laying the Bible upon the h of each of them, said 'Receive power to preach the Word of God sincerely,' thus they all rose up Bishops."

After thus gravely setting forth this ridiculous story, Cham ney adds that he had the account orally from "*one nam Thomas Bluet,*" who received it orally from *one Thomas Ne* an officer of Bishop Bonner's, who was sent by Bonner to Bishop of Landaff, to forbid him to act in the consecration, a to be a witness of whatever might transpire. This seems have been the first *written* account of the mysterious Nags-he Consecration; seeing that Champney obtained it *orally fr* "*one named Thomas Bluet,*" who received it from *a certa Thomas Neal.* Mark; it is now fifty-seven years since occurrence; and now, for the first time, it is written. Af fifty-seven years it had amounted to nothing more than hearsa

The third and last allegation against the English consecrations, is based on the assumed insufficiency of the form of Consecration used; the records showing that the Ordinal of Edward VI. was the one used on that occasion.

These three allegations we propose to treat separately, and in the following order. 1st. The Nag's-head Story; 2nd. Barlow's want of Consecration; and 3rd. The insufficiency of the form used by Barlow, at Parker's Consecration. These three are the principal allegations of Romanists against the English Succession. Some minor points have been raised, but these are believed to be the only ones to which Romanists have ever attached much importance.

And first, the Nags-head Story. This remarkable story, were we entirely without positive testimony to the fact of Parker's Consecration, would justly take rank with the story of "Pope Joan," if not with the Arabian Nights Entertainments. Even in modern times, when far less importance is attached to consecrated *places* than formerly, the idea of anything so important as the Consecration of a Bishop taking place in a *tavern*, could hardly escape public ridicule; and we venture to assert that such a Consecration would command little more respect than did the modern story of Wesley having made Cooke Bishop, "up stairs in Bristol;" though all will admit that a Consecration thus private *might* have all the circumstances necessary to validity.

But the question most naturally arises, what could have been the object of conducting a ceremony of so much importance in the estimation of the English people, and of all Christendom, in secret? Surely, it was contrary to all custom, either ancient or modern. Moreover, there was no necessity for it. The Protestants were, at that time, in no danger of persecution from Romanists, seeing that the Crown, the Parliament, and the minds of the whole nation were on their side; and no public act, after the coronation of their Queen, could have awakened a more lively interest among the English people, than the consecration of their Metropolitan. We know it is said by Romanists, that they sought privacy from the fact that they knew the whole performance would appear ridiculous to

the public, inasmuch as the Consecrator was known not to be a Bishop. But it should be observed that, according to the Nag's-head Story, the Bishops elect went to the tavern with the confident expectation of being consecrated by the "old Bishop of Landaff," whom Romanists, all, admitted to be a genuine Bishop, of their own consecrating; that he came for the purpose of consecrating them, but on his arrival, met Thomas Neal, who bore a message to him from Bonner, charging him, on pain of excommunication, to take no part in the Consecration; that he affected weakness of vision, and declined to act; whereupon they had recourse to Scory, who, at the same time and place, proceeded to make them Bishops! If this part of the story be true, there was then no need for secrecy, on the ground of the intended consecrator being known not to be a Bishop, seeing that Landaff was known and approved of all, as such. Had the time and place been appointed with the expectation that Scory, or some one known not to be a Bishop, was to be the consecrator, there might have been some reason for having it "done in a corner;" but seeing that Landaff was expected to officiate, there could have been no such reason.

But granting that they thus met at the tavern for the purpose of avoiding public notice and remark, the question arises, why did they not choose a place *still more* private than the Nag's-head Tavern in Cheapside? If secrecy had been the object, doubtless private parlors, or upper rooms, might have been commanded, as well as the Nag's-head Tavern, which would certainly have secured the object much better. Or, suppose they had a private apartment in the tavern; then a question arises, how came "*Thomas Neal, an officer of Bonner's,*" to be present, and able to testify to the farcical consecration by Scory? Let it be observed that the whole story rests on the testimony of this *Thomas Neal.* He had come with a letter, or message, from Bonner, to forbid the old Bishop of Landaff acting, and accomplished this object; but most strangely, is at once admitted into the private chamber, and becomes a witness of what transpired. Had he gone out at once, and published the story, it might have appeared as respectable as some of the

disclosures of Titus Bates, of later times; but seeing that Champney, after fifty-seven years, had only seen "one named Thomas Bluet, who had received it of Thomas Neal," in all probability long since in his grave, the story becomes wholly unworthy of credit. Indeed, it is gratifying to observe that even Archbishop Kenrick, in his desperate effort to palm off the Nag's-head Story on the American people, was too careful of his reputation to say that *he* believed it, or that *he* thought it credible.

Another view of the matter has struck us with much force. The impression intended to be made is, that they had resolved to have Consecration private, for purpose of preventing remark on its irregularity. But what course could possibly have done so much to awaken suspicion, as this strange and unheard of procedure? If the object had been to avoid suspicion, and to pass off a sham Consecration for a real one, is it not supposable that ordinary sagacity would have suggested the importance of throwing around it every possible circumstance of regularity? A departure from all usage would naturally cause remark, and lead to the inquiry, why was it thus? Moreover, of all the monarchs of England, no one was ever more remarkable for love of state, or pageant, than was Elizabeth. All writers agree that her tastes, in this respect, would have led her greatly to prefer the Church of Rome. No one who studies her character can believe, for a moment, that she would ever have allowed the Consecration of her primate to take place in a tavern; nor in any private house. In regard to her general conduct in this respect, we are assured by Sanders, (a Romanist,) that notwithstanding the repeal of the old laws, Queen Elizabeth always took care that those whom she nominated for Bishops were Ordained, (Consecrated,) with the ceremonies prescribed by the laws of the realm.

Besides all this, it is not very probable that the "old Bishop of Landaff" would have been very much terrified by the threatening message which he is said to have received from Bonner; seeing that he had already taken the Oath of Allegiance to the new Queen, (Elizabeth,) by which he was as badly embarrassed with the papal authority as he could possibly be by any additional act of disobedience to the papacy.

It may not be out of place here to remark, that even if it were proved that Parker had no other Consecration than the one alleged at Nag's-head, he might, even then, have been a true Bishop, according to ancient usage, and general consent For the assertion that Scory had never been consecrated a Bishop, but had, "under Edward VI. usurped a bishoprick without consecration," is utterly false, if records are to be believed. His Consecration is distinctly recorded in Cranmer's Archi-Episcopal register; he is spoken of by numerous writers as a Bishop, first, of Chichester, and afterwards of Hereford; and but for the Nag's-head Story, no one would ever have doubted that he was such. There can be no reasonable doubt that he was a Bishop, and as such had the right to consecrate other Bishops; for it is a well recognized principle of Ancient Canons, and has been frequently acted on, that even one Bishop may consecrate Bishops; and that their Consecration is to be held *valid;*—though not *canonized.* Hence, if we were to admit the truth of the Nag's-head Story, and yet could prove the fact of Scory's being a Bishop, we could not fail to establish the validity of Parker's Consecration;—provided the form used contained the essence of Consecration. To this, however we attach no importance, farther than it serves to show the falsehood contained in the statement, that Scory "had intruded himself into the episcopal function without consecration." The more falsehoods can be proved to enter into the story, the more we shall be able to show why it should all be discredited.

One more argument against the credibility of this story is drawn from the fact that it declares *all* the new Bishops to have been consecrated by Scory at the same time. (Strangely enough, it has never had any date!) But according to Rymer's Records, as well as Parker's official register, they were consecrated at different times. Thus, Parker was consecrated alone, on the seventeenth of December, 1559. On the twenty-first of the same month, Parker consecrated four others, two more on the second of March, 1560, and still two others on the twenty-fourth of March. So it is stated in the register kept by Parker, and which was found among his papers after

his death. In accordance with this, the State Records of Elizabeth, still accessible in the royal archives, show that her commissions for the Consecrations of the new Bishops were issued at different times, and at times corresponding with the registered dates of the Consecration. If, then, the Nag's-head Story be true, not only must Parker's register be false, but the authentic, civil records of the nation be rejected.

We are aware that the question may be raised, with some show of plausibility, How are we to account for the existence and currency of such a story, if there were no foundation for it? To this, we might, without any violation of logic, reply that it is not our work to account for it. If the truthful man were bound to account for every falsehood which might be set in circulation, and show how it came to be, his labors, we apprehend, would be greater than many would be willing to undertake.

We may here remark, however, that Parker's *Confirmation* did take place eight days before his Consecration; and judging from certain incidental points in history, we conclude that it may have been no uncommon thing for the Bishops about those times, to meet at a private house or tavern, for this purpose, (there being no public service connected with it,) and for the Bishop elect to furnish a dinner to the Bishops and others, at his own expense. It is by no means improbable that something of this kind may have occurred at the time of Parker's confirmation, (ratification,) and that it may have been at the Nag's-head Tavern; and *Thomas Neal*, or some other person, either from ignorance or wickedness, may have made the Nag's-head Story out of this. This is plausible; and the more so, from the fact that the story, as generally held by Romanists, goes on to say that, after the Consecration, a dinner was served up at Parker's expense. In support of this, we will quote a few sentences from Heylin, which we have just now observed:

"But to proceed unto the consecration of the new archbishop, the first thing to be done, after the passing the royal assent for ratifying of the election of the dean and chapter, was the confirming it in the Court of Arches, according to the usual form in that behalf; which being accordingly performed, the Vicar Gen-

eral, the Dean of the Arches, the proctors and officers of the court, whose presence was required at this solemnity, were entertained at a dinner provided for them, at the Nag's Head tavern, in Cheapside; for which, although Parker paid the shot, yet shall the Church be called to an after-reckoning."

We now come to speak of *Authentic Records concerning the Consecration of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury.*

Having already pointed out some of the features in the Nag's-head Story, which make it altogether incredible, we now proceed to present positive testimony, showing that Parker was regularly consecrated, in accordance with the Ordinal of the Church, established by Edward VI., repealed by Queen Mary, and restored on the accession of Elizabeth. And, proceeding on the maxim that "the better way of refuting a falsehood is to demonstrate its opposite," we hope to satisfy our readers of the absurdity of the entire Nag's-head Story.

Cardinal Pole, the Archbishop of Canterbury, under Queen Mary, survived the Queen but a few hours. Hence, on the accession of Elizabeth, she found the See of Canterbury vacant.

The importance of the post required that it should be filled with the least possible delay. Parker had filled several important posts, in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; but during the reign of Mary, had shut himself up in "lettered seclusion." Now, he was recalled to court, to assist in the work of restoring the Reformation. His entire devotion to this work, together with his eminent learning, soon signalized him to the Queen as a fit person to fill the vacant See of Canterbury. Accordingly, on the 18th of July, 1559, the Queen issued her *Conge d'elire* to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury for an election; and on the first day of August following, Matthew Parker was duly elected. On the ninth of September following, she issued her royal commission to six Bishops, ordering them to proceed to the confirmation and Consecration of the Bishop elect. These Bishops were Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham, Gilbert, Bishop of Bath, David, Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony, Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, and John Scory, Bishops, at that time, without Sees. From some cause, this commission was never executed. Most probably, some of the Bishops therein named remained Romanists, and

so refused to act in the Consecration. In fact, it is well-known that many of the Bishops of Mary opposed the Reformation under Elizabeth. On the sixth of December, another commission was issued to the same effect; but directed to Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, William Barlow, John Scory, Miles Coverdale, Richard (John) de Bedford, John de Thetford, and John Bale, Bishop of Osory, calling on them, *or any four of them*, to proceed to the confirmation and Consecration. Anthony Kitchin, "the old Bishop of Llandaff," it is true, refused, or failed, to act, either from infirmity, or from a timidity in presiding at the first Consecration under the new law; and William Barlow became the presiding Bishop, assisted by Scory, Coverdale, and John Hodgkin, of Bedford. These four proceeded to the confirmation and Consecration of Parker. The confirmation took place on the ninth of December, 1559, and the Consecration on Sunday, the seventeenth of the same month, (1559,) by the same Bishops who had confirmed the election eight days previous. The Consecration was performed in the Archi-Episcopal Chapel at Lambeth, and was duly recorded in the Registers of Canterbury, and also in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It was also found in Parker's register, after his death. We shall copy the one found in Cambridge, that being the one printed in the Works of Archbishop Bramhall, and differing very little, as we shall hereafter see, from the Canterbury Record, kept in Lambeth Palace. Believing that it may be agreeable to many of our readers, we here present a translation of it.

"The order of the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Father in Christ, Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, held in his Chapel at Lambeth, at his manor, on Sunday, the 17th day of the month of DECEMBER, ANNO DOMINI, 1559.

In the first place, the chapel was adorned with hangings in the eastern part; moreover, the floor was covered with red cloth; the table, placed in the east necessary for performing the sacred rites, was covered with a cloth and cushion. Besides, four chairs for the four Bishops, to whom had been committed the duty of consecrating the Archbishop, had been placed in the southeast. Moreover, a kneeling stool, covered with cloth and cushions, on which the Bishops kneeled on bended knees, was placed before the chairs. In like manner, a chair and kneeling stool, covered with cloth and cushion, had been placed in the northern quarter of the eastern part of the same chapel.

These things being thus arranged in their order, (due form,) about five or six o'clock in the morning, the Archbishop approached the chapel through the western gate, clothed in a toga and scarlet cap, four torches preceding, and accompanied by the four Bishops who were to officiate at his consecration; viz. by name, William Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, but now elected to the bishoprick of Chichester; John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, but now called to Hereford; Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter, and John Hodgkins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. After that all these had occupied the seats prepared for them, each in his rank, morning prayers were read by the Chaplain, Andrew Pearson, in a clear voice; which finished, John Scory, of whom we have before made mention, ascended the desk, and having taken for himself, as a text, "The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder," &c., (or from the Vulgate, "*Seniores ergo qui in nobis sunt obsero consenior*,"&c. proceeded to discourse, not inelegantly. The discourse finished, the Archbishop and the other four Bishops went out of the chapel to prepare themselves for the Holy Communion; and, having gone into the vestry through the northern door, they returned without delay, dressed in this manner:—The Archbishop was clothed in a surplice, as they call it. The Bishop elect of Chichester, prepared for performing the sacred rites, wore a silk cap, to whom ministered and lent them aid, the two archi-episcopal Chaplains, Nicholas Bullingham, archdeacon of Lincoln, and Edward Gest, also archdeacon of Canterbury, in like manner clothed with silk caps. Hereford elect, and the suffragan of Bedford, were clothed in linen surplices. Miles Coverdale used a long woolen gown.

In this manner clothed, they proceeded to celebrate the communion, the Archbishop resting on bended knees on the lowest step of the chancel. The Gospel being finished, Hereford elect, Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale concerning whom before, the Bishop elect of Chichester, sitting before the Archbishop in a chair by the table, addressed him in these words: "Rev. Father in God; This man, of equal learning and piety, we offer and present to you to be consecrated Archbishop." Immediately after they had said these things, the commission of the Queen for the consecration of the Archbishop was presented which being read by the Rev. Thomas Yale, LL.D., the oath of royal supremacy, or of preserving its supreme authority, decreed and promulged the first year of the reign of our illustrious Queen Elizabeth, was required of the same Archbishop, which, when he had solemnly laid his hands on the Holy Gospel, he took upon himself in a set form of words, the Bishop elect of Chichester having prefaced a few things; and having exhorted the people to devotion, he prepared himself for repeating the Liturgies; the choir responding. This having been performed, after some questions proposed by the elect Chichester, and after the devotions and certain suffrages, performed in the presence of God, according to the formula in the book published by act of parliament, the Bishops of Chichester and Hereford, the suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, having placed their hands on the Archbishop's head, said, in English: "Take the Holy Ghost and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness."

These words having been thus spoken, they delivered into his hands the Holy Bible, after this manner saying to him:—"See that thou be diligent in reading

and continually meditate on those things which are written in these Books. Be unwilling to lack diligence in these books, in order that the advancement coming thence may be known to all, and may be remarkable. Have diligent care of those things which pertain to you, and to your office of teaching; for in this way shalt thou save, not only thyself, but thy hearers; through Jesus Christ our Lord."*

After they had said these things, the Bishop elect of Chichester proceeded to the remaining ceremonies of the communion, delivering to the Archbishop no pastoral staff, with which the Archbishop, together with the other Bishops, communicated, with some others also.

The ceremonies having been, at length, ended, the Archbishop departed through the northern door of the eastern part of the Chapel, accompanied by those four Bishops who had consecrated him; and, attended by those same Bishops, he returned through the same door, clothed in a white episcopal surplice, and with a *crimera*, (as they call it,) of black silk. Moreover, he wore, fastened around his neck, a collar of precious sable skins, in common language called sables. And in like manner, Chichester and Hereford were each clothed in their episcopal vestments; in the surplice and *crimera*, also. Dr. Coverdale and the Suffragan of Bedford, wore only long gowns.

The Archbishop, then proceeding toward the west door, gave to Thomas Doyle, the steward, John Baker, the treasurer, and John Marsh, keeper of the rolls, each, a white staff; in this manner signifying to them their duties and offices. These things having been performed in their own fashion, as aforesaid, the Archbishop left the chapel through the western door, those of nobler blood, in his own family, preceding him; the rest following behind.

All these things were performed in the presence of the Rev. Bishops, Edmand Grindall, Bishop elect of London, Richard Cockes, Bishop elect of Ely, Edwin Sandes, Bishop elect of Worcester, Anthony Huse, principal Knight and chief secretary of the Archbishop, and Thomas Argall, Knight and register at Chichester,—the first officer of Canterbury,—Thomas Willet and John Jacent, notaries public; and some others."

"Agrees with the original in the library of Corpus Christi College, at Cambridge.

MATTHEW WHINN, Notary Public, and
January 8, 1674. Principal Register, Acad. Cant."

This copy was obtained by Archbishop Bramhall for insertion in his Works, which were printed in 1677. It will be observed that its correctness is certified by the Notary Public and Register of Cant., Matthew Whinn.

The Nag's-head Story being entirely overthrown by this testimony, the Romanists set on foot another story, represent-

* By reference to the Ordinal of Edward VI. we observe that our translation does not fully agree with it in language. It was spoken in English, and translated by the clerk into Latin, which gave occasion for some modification; and to this is added the liability to change in our free translation into English.

ing this as a forgery of modern times. To meet this, Archbishop Bramhall, or some one for him, procured the following certificates.

"Cambridge, Jan. 11th, 1674.

We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, having seen the original, whereof this writing is a perfect copy, and considered the hand, and other circumstances thereof, are fully persuaded that it is a true and genuine record of the Rites and ceremonies of Archbishop Parker's consecration, and as ancient as the date it bears. In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands the day and year above written,

HEN. PAMAN, Ort. Pub.
HEN. MORE, D. D.
RA. WIDDRINGTON, S. T. D.

and D. MARS, P."

After this, there seems to have been another story gotten up, that this record of Cambridge did not harmonize with that of Canterbury, kept in Lambeth Palace; and hence it was to be inferred that one, or both, must be false. To meet this slander, some one in 1720, (we know not who,) procured the following certificate from Lambeth. Courayer states in his "Defense of the Validity of the English Ordinations," that he had deposited the original in the King's Library (at Paris,) on the ninth of May, 1722; whence we may infer that he procured it for his own use in preparing his "Defense," which appeared about that time.

"We, whose names are subscribed, do certify, that we have collated and compared together, the Records of the R. R. Matthew Parker's consecration, printed in a book entitled, 'The Works of the most Rev. Father in God, John Bramhall D. D., late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland, printed at Dublin in the year 1677, *in Fol.*, which Records, excepting some passages hereafter mentioned, we have found very conformable to the original which is preserved in the archives of the archi-episcopal Palace at Lambeth near London.

Dated at the Archi-Episcopal Palace at Lambeth, this 15th day of March, O. S., 1720.

Signed in the presence of

W. AYERST, S. T. B., and E. A. Pr.
JAMES PIERS, J. C.
PAT. PIERS, de Girardin, Dr. of the Sorbonne.
D. WILKINS, S. T. P., Rev. in Christo Patri Guil. Archiep. Cant. á Sacris Dom."

The discrepancies between the two Records, named in the above certificate, they give in full, naming the pages and lines. They are fourteen in all; and the differences are merely verbal, and do not, in the least, affect their agreement in sense. We can hardly doubt that the same reporter furnished both copies for permanent record, (perhaps one was copied from the other,) and there is internal evidence of their having been written during the progress of the service, on the 17th of December, 1559.

Of the four consecrating Bishops, we may here remark, that their well-known position in the Church, long previous to Parker's Consecration, should place the fact of their Episcopal Consecration beyond controversy. Barlow had been Bishop of Bath and Wells in the time of Edward VI.; was displaced by Mary, and at the time of Parker's Consecration, was Bishop elect of Chichester. Scory had been Bishop of Chichester, and at the time of Parker's Consecration, was Bishop elect of Hereford. Miles Coverdale had grown old under many labors in the work of the Reformation. For a short time, he had been Bishop of Exeter, but, during the bloody reign of Mary, had resided abroad, and never became Bishop of another diocese. John Hodgkin, (named above as John de Bedford,) was Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. All these four had been named in the Queen's Commission, and all had been regularly consecrated Bishops. Moreover, all of them had been Bishops of Dioceses, except Hodgkin, who was a Suffragan, but was not, from this cause, any the less capable of acting in the consecration of Parker. We shall see, hereafter, that the Romanists afterward called in question the fact of Barlow's having ever been consecrated, himself; and as he was the consecrator of Parker, they proposed thereby to raise a question concerning the validity of Parker's Consecration. This will be treated in another chapter.

In addition to the records already produced, we find, that on the 22d day of March, 1560, Archbishop Parker received the investiture of Canterbury in his temporalities, which is strong presumptive evidence of his having been recently consecrated.

As for the Nags-head fable, it is manifest, as we have before said, that it was not known, nor thought of, until more than

fifty years after the Consecration of Parker. Not a syllable of it appears in any of the Romish writings within that time. Even Sanders, who violently attacked the English Consecrations, and attempted to invalidate them, says not a word of this story.

In answer to the positive testimony which we have produced, they argue, first, that it was fifty years after the Consecration of Parker, before the Lambeth and Cambridge records were proclaimed to the world, and hence, that they are to be suspected of forgery. Second, that the persons who published them were interested, and therefore are to be suspected. Third, that the records do not agree, and therefore are to be set aside.

In answer to the first objection, Courayer has well said:

"If the fable of the ordination of the Nag's-head had been more ancient than it is, we should have had the record sooner published, to destroy it; but where the method of this proceeding was known, what necessity was there to publish an account of it? How many records are there shut up, which are no less authentic for that reason? And besides, was it ever refused to be produced, or shown, to them who wanted information in this matter? It is a strange thing if all the records that are kept private should be suspected because they were never exposed. What becomes of all our history if, to remove all suspicions, it should be objected that the records had hitherto been kept secret?"

But the fact was really *published* within Parker's life, which shows that it had not been "done in a corner," nor was intended to be kept secret. In the "Lives of the Archbishops," published at London in 1572, before Parker's death, it is stated, that—

"In the year 1559, he was chosen Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, and was afterwards, in the same year, on the 17th day of December, consecrated according to law by four Bishops, William, Bishop of Chichester, John, of Hereford, Miles, late Bishop of Exeter, and Richard, (John,) of Bedford. In the margin of that work it is written, when translated, 'These consecrations and confirmations appear in the registers.'"

After Parker's death, when the Jesuits began to circulate the Nag's-head story, Archbishop Abbot, willing to do everything reasonable, to prove the genuineness of the Record, consented that four Romanists, three of whom were Jesuits, should come to Lambeth, and in his presence, and the presence of the Bishops of London, Durham, Ely, Bath, Lincoln, and Rochester, examine the Records, to their satisfaction. The pro-

posal was accepted; and at the end of the examination, they promised to report the result. After leaving, however, they requested that the Records should be *sent to them*, to examine more fully, by themselves. Of course, this was not permitted; and thereupon, they raised a report, that investigation had been refused. To have permitted the Official Records to go out into the world, and into the hands of sworn enemies, who might either interpolate, or destroy them, would have been most unwise, and contrary to all precedent. They were told that they might return to the palace, and examine them to their satisfaction; but this they refused to do, and persisted in complaining that they had not been permitted to examine them!

In short, all doubts raised by Romanists, of the genuineness of the Records, are based on assumptions of that character, which, if admitted, would forever destroy the science of History, and throw the world into entire doubt and uncertainty as to the truth of every fact, the moment it had become a thing of the past, and ceased to be visible; unless the principle were admitted, that the assertion of some Jesuit could set everything right, and remove all doubts.

As for their second objection, that the authors of the Records, and of their publication, were interested, and therefore not to be believed, it might be sufficient to reply, so were the authors of the Nag's-head story. Moreover, if this be admitted, then it follows, that the Records of no Nation, State, or Church, are to be believed, if kept by themselves. To make them reliable, they must be kept by strangers, who have no interest in them whatever; or, forsooth, by enemies, whose business it is to place the worst construction on everything. No one, we presume, will question, that had the recording of the Elizabethan Consecrations been committed to Jesuits, they might have appeared different from what they do; but whether more reliable, the common sense of the world will judge.

The third objection, that there is a discrepancy among the Records, and therefore, that none of them are to be relied on, requires examination, and to this we shall next ask the attention of our readers.

Art. VI.—FREE CHURCHES.

We do not propose, in our present discussion, to enter largely into the theoretical questions to which our theme sometimes gives rise, and which have been treated with sufficient fullness in former Numbers of our Review; but, rather, to bring the subject to a practical test, the test of experience and observation. It is not amiss, however, for a writer to define his own personal position, even when writing anonymously; provided the knowledge of that position by the reader may serve to increase the force of the argument to a candid mind, or relieve it of the danger of a prejudiced reception. We shall have many things to say, in the course of this discussion, from which an unguarded reader might infer, that we started from the stand-point of antagonism to Free Churches. We should not regard the injustice of that inference towards ourself, because we write impersonally. But, as it would, also, be unjust to our argument, and might lessen the weight which it would otherwise carry with it, we begin with saying, that not only are we a friend of Free Churches in theory, but we have proved the sincerity of our friendship by years of earnest toil in their service; and now, if we could, with a clear judgment and an honest conscience, make our review a simple, outright and thorough defense of the system, it would give us unfeigned and unmingled happiness to do so. With our brethren, who are laboring under the burden and heat of the day, as we ourself have long labored, to render effectual and successful, a plan which has the unquestionable authority of primitive practice, and is the only one, as it seems to us, thoroughly accordant with the spirit of Christianity, the freeness and fullness of Christ's Redemption, and the general precepts of the Word of God; with these brethren we have the quickest, strongest sympathy; we rejoice at every instance of their success, as a gain for a good cause we should rejoice, with joy unspeakable, if we could believe that that cause was destined, under the present order of the Church, to a speedy and universal triumph.

We may add, that we do not write under the influence of hopelessness, created by disappointment. Accustomed to regard the propitious issues of the Ministry as the gift of God, we deny all title to earthly honor on account of them. But, we may say, for the sake of our argument, that it has pleased our Divine Master to crown with great and singular blessing the enterprise to which our own energy has been mainly devoted; and we should reckon it a heavy personal affliction, if that enterprise should ever be diverted (we are sure it would only be by the force of inexorable necessity) from its adherence to a Free Gospel, in a Free Church. We have nothing, in our own recollection, which leads us to speak less hopefully than would any other who had had the same length and breadth and depth of experience with ourself. To "experience" we should add *observation*; for the opinion we entertain has been formed, in part, by looking at others' labors, and viewing the work of Free Churches in other lands than our own.

We propose, now, as briefly as may be, to give the result of our study, our observation, and our experience.

Our definite proposition we will state as follows: while we agree fully with the Scriptural and Catholic doctrine which lies at the basis of the Free System, and would rejoice if every Church in our Communion could be placed on that basis; and, while we do not doubt the practicability of the System, *under certain favoring circumstances*, and believe, that in every such instance it ought to be adopted, we do also believe, that its universal, or *general* adoption, *in this country*, is impossible; and that, therefore, any attempt to that end is useless and inexpedient. We believe, farther, that the cases in which it may be adopted, are few and exceptional. This is our proposition.

The Free System, as organized and offered to us in this country, is radically defective in principle, and, generally, impracticable in use, because it is an attempt to restore one portion of the ancient plan, without other organic parts, which are essential to the vitality and efficient working of the whole. It is like the heart, the source of life, deprived of the func-

tions of the lungs, the means of providing life. We proceed to illustrate. The advocates of the Free System are unquestionably right in the position, that it was the System of primitive and even of Apostolic times, and that it is still the System of the major part of that great body, the Church Catholic—the Oriental Church, the Church of Rome, and the Anglican Communion. We, who have adopted the Pew System, are the undoubted minority of the Catholic Christians on the face of the earth. But those advocates have forgot, that it was allied, in the Ancient Church, and is now, where it exists in vigor, with an entire organization, which we have almost totally lost, and which the boldest of those advocates would hardly dream of restoring. As part of an organic structure, it was natural, easy, and effective in operation. Taken out of that organism, and set at work by itself, it must, generally, be inefficient, difficult and abnormal in action. Where is now our parochial constitution, which makes every individual member of the Church, within defined limits, a member of the Parish, as was the case in early times? Do the uncompromising friends of the Free System suppose, that in those days, as in ours, and in those lands which the Church then possessed, as in our own country, generally, a Christian was free to wander whither he would, and connect himself with this or that Parish, at his pleasure? No; he belonged, of necessity, to the Parish where he lived; and that Parish had definite territorial limits; and, residing within those limits, he could be called upon, authoritatively, to contribute to the support of the Parish Church; and he could not easily evade the call. This control over her members, the Church, in this country, has lost; and who will dare to propose that she regain it? On the contrary, take a European or, better, an Oriental Laity, (for it is in the East that the primitive features of the ancient parochial life are most strictly preserved,) and we can imagine the effect, if a Christian should come to his Priest and say, 'I propose to remove, parochially, to another Church, without changing my place of residence. I shall no longer attend Church, or receive the Means of Grace, here, or contribute to the support of this Parish. Will you transfer me to —— Church? If you will

not, I will go without a transfer.' The Rector would at first, doubtless, be astonished at a proceeding, such as had never before been heard of. His second movement would be to go to the Bishop, and report the matter to him. The Bishop would send for the offender. He would say to him, when he came into his presence, 'My son, this is an irregularity which you propose. Such an act is contrary to all rule, has never been allowed, and cannot be tolerated. If you wish to belong to another Parish, you must remove your residence, and live within its jurisdiction.' An Oriental Christian would, probably, submit at once. If he did not, the order would be given to the Rector of the Church to which he wished to transfer his allegiance, not to receive him, and, though he might come into the Church to worship, not to give him, or his family, the ministration of the Sacraments, marriage, burial, and other ordinances of religion. If he persisted in denying his parochial ties and obligations, he would be subjected to formal discipline, and eventually, perhaps, to excommunication.

Now, take any considerable section of one of our large cities, and set it off as a Parish. Let it be a matter of obligation and necessity, that every member of the Church, rich or poor, residing within its limits, belong to it, and contribute, according to his ability, for its support, the Rector having an authoritative voice to this end; we should thus have one of the original conditions of a Free Church, which we have lost entirely, or to all efficient purposes. Without this condition, we labor in vain in behalf of the Free System. We take one feature of the ancient organization, and omit another, without which the first is, generally, impracticable.

But we have not yet told the whole truth. We have no *lay discipline*, or next to none. We know how this necessity was left unprovided for in the Anglican Reformation. The result is, that hardly any Protestant body has less of a law and rule of discipline for the Laity, than have we. We have no code, like those of ancient times, of which only portions have come down to us; and, more than that, we have not the official control which the ancient Clergy had over the Laity; and we cannot have it, without the ancient parochial structure. What

shall we do, then? Shall we restore it? We need not argue the absolute impossibility of restoration, in the present state of the Church, and of general opinion among us. But, if we restore one we must restore the other. The ancient laws went with the ancient limitation of Parishes, and were inseparable from it. Otherwise, we should have laws from which one could escape at any time, if he fled into a Parish where his irregularities would be overlooked. But the old laws, combined with the parochial tie, furnished a hold upon the laity which we have lost. Every member of the Church was under guardianship, and under efficient control. If he violated no written law, yet, if he did not do his duty, as a faithful Christian, towards his Parish Church, he could be subjected to reproof and discipline; and he could not run away to another part of the Fold, at his will. No member could abstain from worship, (and, by "member," we mean 'baptised person,') or neglect to receive the other means of grace, with impunity; and, receiving them, he could not well avoid doing his part towards sustaining them in the House of God. Thus, Churches were Free; but, in those Free Churches, no *man* was free. Every member was known, and every one must do his duty as a Parishioner. We have said enough to indicate our meaning, and enough for our present purpose, without enumerating other features of the early Church, which were intimately connected with parochial life, and helped to sustain it in vigorous condition.

We proceed now to show how the two-fold deficiency which we have cited, operates adversely to the success of Free Churches in this country, and makes their continuance, necessarily, precarious and uncertain. It will be seen, that the peculiar and insuperable difficulties against which they struggle, are the direct result of working for the effects of the Primitive System, with only a portion of the primitive machinery.

We understand by a "Free Church," (and in this discussion we *mean* by a "Free Church,") one which is a *Parish* Church, having the usual parochial organization, and to be supported within itself. We exclude, therefore, from view at present, "*Mission* Churches," which are sustained from without. We also mean by a "Free Church," one which is to be supported

oluntary Offerings, laid upon the Altar; which is claimed
, and is, the legitimate and regular method of supporting
Churches, the method to be relied upon for their support,
se they replace Pew Churches, and become universal. The
rtory is to the Free Church, what the rents of seats are to
Pew Church—the ordinary and regular source of supply.
criptions may be resorted to under either system;
they are not of rule and custom; they are an exceptional
iod, intended for emergencies, to supply deficiency arising
r the regular mode. *The rule of Free Churches is the
tory: the rule of Pew Churches is Rents.* There may
be *Endowments* under either system; but they too are ex-
ional, and under both systems will, probably, always
re in this country. The question is, in exact and fair
s, can Free Churches, with the Offertory for their support,
the place of Pew Churches, with Rents for their support,
at the former shall be the general mode, the acknowl-
d rule and the habit of Church life? This is the precise
tion. We reply, with unfeigned regret and sorrow, but
the fullest conviction of our judgment, a conviction forced
us, against every predilection and wish of our heart, by
nited power of study, observation and experience, NO.
'e advance to the reasons for this unwelcome conclusion.
t, there is not within our knowledge a solitary instance in
land, in which a Parish Church has succeeded upon the
System, as we have defined it. The assertion may, at
, seem to be a rash one, but we speak advisedly, and after
inquiry. Our practical relation to the enterprise, has
ed us within reach of much *private* testimony, from fellow-
kers in the same cause, and in every instance it has helped
nfirm our own slowly formed and independent opinion. Is
e a Parish Church in the United States which has been
ported by the free-will Offerings of the people, for a suffi-
t time to be called a success, without one of these exceptional
litions; either the presence of a single man, or two or three
, who, as authors of the enterprise, and having large abil-
have stood ready, at considerable sacrifice and great cost
hemselves, to make up all deficiencies in the working of the
, either because they had an enthusiastic love for the prin-

ciple, or were personally interested to an extraordinary degre as founders of the enterprise; or the supply of deficiency i the Offertory by forced subscriptions in the Parish, or chari from abroad; or finally, by the good fortune of having a Rec tor who can provide for himself from private resources, be cause he has means of his own, or has rich friends who ar ready to help him, or resorts to other methods for obtaining, a least a part of his livelihood? If there is any such Churc in this country, we have failed to discover it. Besides othe inquiry, we have examined, extensively, lists of Free Churche which have been published; but we do not yet find one clea case, though we have earnestly desired to find many. There is not a single instance in which a Free Church has succeeded, within the strict limitations of the system which must be the ground of general dependence, if that system is, as a rule, to replace the Pew System. If one or two instances could be found, they would hardly, in so large a matter, perceptibly invalidate our argument

It will not do for us to say, that we must be content to re sort to odd shifts and extra expedients, in behalf of Fre Churches, for the sake of the principle. That is an availabl and fair argument for *single* cases, and we honor those who ar sustaining Free Churches, in *any* honorable way. The questio now is, is this or that system, *as a general rule and prac tice*, the recognized habit of the Church? Let it be remem bered, all along, that we do not argue against the establish ment and support of Free Churches by *any* means that ar lawfully available. On the contrary, we rejoice in every on that exists, although some of them do excite in us a very pain ful sympathy, from the struggle which they have to mak even with the aid of extraordinary expedients. Towards the hard-worked and anxious Rectors, especially,—men who, for th sake of a primitive truth, are enduring conflicts and trial which the Church at large knows nothing of; enduring the in patient silence, lest the principle for which they endure, suf fer by the disclosure of them,—towards those men, whose tale of trouble have often been poured into our fraternal ear, seek ing consolation from one who was a laborer in the same cause

and who therefore knew something of its difficulties and its sorrows; towards those men, we feel ourselves drawn by the strongest cords of affectionate sympathy and interest. Little do *they*, (as there are many, especially young clergymen,) who are ardent theorists in this behalf, and *only* theorists, understand and appreciate the full scope of the argument with which they deal. We were once young ourself, and we can sympathize with *them* also; for we have still the same love as ever for the principle, and we once had the same inexperienced enthusiasm which now fires their breasts. We honor the feeling, but we must in frankness say, that the glorious thoughts of a free Gospel for the Poor, of the largeness and fullness of salvation by our Blessed Lord, and of the indiscriminate equality of sinful men before God, and in the Communion of His Holy Church, with which, perchance, their minds and hearts are rushing to reply to such arguments as our present one, need a greater breadth—a breadth which will compass the entire system of evangelical methods which the Apostles delivered to after-ages—before those thoughts can be brought to any extensive and effectual application in practice, and then, perhaps, they will find themselves encountered, as we have found ourself fronted, by the evident and complete impossibility, at the present, of restoring to the Church the whole of her rightful heritage of authority and discipline. If these youthful and ardent warriors will begin their crusade farther back, from the Apostolic starting-point, we are not sure that we would not join their ranks; but we would prefer to see the restoration of the primitive polity, engaging the thoughts and moving the hearts and lips, and pens and hands of the chief Pastors of the Church, with whom, more than with any other single class, the true remedy lies.

We have digressed from the straight line of our argument; but it has been with a forethought; for we felt at the beginning, that what we have just said must have a place in our Article, and it is, perhaps, as appropriate here as elsewhere.

We have noticed three exceptions to the regular method, which are resorted to, ordinarily, for the support of Free Churches. The first is the patronage of one or a few rich men.

Such men have, in some instances, been the founders, and are now the principal supporters of them. No men deserve more of the Church; none have made a better use of their wealth. Would that their number were multiplied a hundred-fold! But no one imagines that the American Church can be furnished with edifices, or that the ministrations of Christianity can be *generally* sustained in this way. No one, we trust, desires it, for there are evils resulting from this mode, which go far to counterbalance the good. It is a favorite objection to Pew Churches, (and in some Parishes it is a just one,) that the Rector is a Minister of a few, a select set, who are able to buy or hire pews, and upon whom, therefore, he is dependent. He is the Minister, it is said, of a class; and his subjection to it is derogatory to the dignity of his office and the largeness of his commission as an Ambassador of Christ. But is it any better, is it not far worse, as is the case in many Free Churches, to be dependent, mainly, on a single man? Does it not, still more, detract from ministerial dignity—still more endanger ministerial fidelity? Is it a desirable condition for any Parish? Furthermore, in such cases as this, the patron is generally left, even when the Congregation becomes large and able, to continue to bear the greater part of the burden alone, the others feeling sure that he will meet any deficiency of theirs. There is human nature in Free Churches, as elsewhere; and it is human nature, at least as developed in this country, to receive religious privileges, where they may be had, *gratis*. It is human nature also, while receiving such generous benefaction to feel jealous of the superior influence which, of necessity, it gives within the Parish to him who exercises it. These are no imaginary evils, but positive and practical disadvantages. Another is, that such an enterprise is precarious, depending as it does upon the continued interest, or wealth, or perhaps upon the life of the benefactor. We know Free Churches where the withdrawal or death of a single man, would ruin the Parish or compel it to resort to the Pew System for support; unless indeed it should rouse the great remainder to an effort which they will never make while they have a generous friend to provide for them.

It is desirable, in all such cases as that now before us, and, indeed, it is a recommendation which we would earnestly press upon the attention of all Congregations in Free Churches, that the Parish be placed, as soon as possible, out of the reach of danger, by an *Endowment*, sufficient, at least, for the support of the Clergy. This is the second condition of the existence of Free Churches in this country, which we noted; and while we do not believe, that it can be made universal among us, so that *all* Churches may be made free, we do look upon it as the only security for a Free Church which will stand, amidst all the fluctuations of our American life. If the large-hearted men, who are sustaining some of these Churches, would give outright the sum of which their annual gift is the interest, the enterprises which they love and cherish would be placed, at once, upon a sure and permanent basis; and they themselves would be relieved from a load of anxious care and responsibility which no one would wish to carry all his life long. And if other men, of equal means, whose wealth has not yet, in this free and liberal manner, been consecrated to the Lord,—men whom we can count by hundreds within the pale of our Communion,—can be induced to follow this benignant example, how surely, permanently and abundantly, might at least the neglected masses in our great cities be supplied with the means of grace and salvation! This matter has not received, we believe, the attention which it deserves. Why might not such a city as New York have, in this way, its Free Church, with an endowed Clergy, in every one of those desolate regions of vice and ignorance and poverty, where a self-supporting Church can never stand on any other than the ancient system! We make this exception in favor of the old plan, because we have seen, in foreign cities, such poor districts well supplied within themselves. But there the old rule and discipline prevailed. Every baptized person was within reach, and under control, as a member of the Church; and the united contributions of the mass of the poor, provided sufficiently for the wants of the Parish. But we do not expect to see such a sight among ourselves; and the best plan which our loss of the primitive style leaves to us is that which we now propose. There is wealth enough, among the Churchmen of New York, (and the same

is true of some other cities,) to accomplish the work, withou a sacrifice that would really involve a self-denial. Interest in deed, earthly interest, might prompt to it; for, who can por tray the fearful dangers which hang over our social and civ state, if these great festering sores of corruption are muc longer left untended, and untreated by the medicament of r ligion? The depreciation and insecurity of property are on of the temporal ills that must follow, nay, that have alread to some extent, followed the moral debasement of whole se tions of some of our large cities. "Godliness is profitable un to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come." May those who have the power remedy the evil, be wise in time! The time in which remed is possible, is fast passing away.

We noted a third method by which the cause of Fr Churches is sometimes aided; viz. the self-denying labors Rectors, who seek to eke out an insufficient support, b resorting to other means of increasing their income. We ha seen this done by teaching. We have seen it done by writi for Periodicals, by work as copyists, and by other modes st more extraordinary. Such men show their love for the syste by indubitable proof; especially when, as in some instances true, they would find their own temporal comfort greatly pr moted by abandoning it. But their example, we fear, is n destined to be extensively followed. Free Churches will nev be largely propagated in this way; nor is it to be desired th they should be, since it involves the Minister of God in u professional avocations, and takes him, in part, away from t care of souls. Another class have means of their own. W know only two or three Rectors of Free Churches of this d scription. But why should not the number be greatly i creased? We have, among our Clergy, not a very few w possess a competency of this world's goods,—some by inhe tance, some by marriage, some, more advanced in life, fr their own saved earnings. Many of them are doing nothin because, as we suppose, they are not compelled to do anythi They can live comfortably without work; and they do sometimes for reasons which would avail nothing to keep the from active abor, if their living depended upon it. Oth

are still Rectors of Parishes, not unfrequently of wealthy Parishes. Now, here is an enterprise which invites such men to noble fields of usefulness. Let them go into destitute places, where no man careth for the souls of the perishing multitude. Let them plant the Church and preach the Gospel there, taking nothing of any man, as they alone are able to do. It seems to us, that, instead of rusting in idleness, or traveling for pastime in foreign parts, or receiving an income which they do not need, from wealthy Churches, they should be the foremost, as they might be the freest, of the Church's missionaries. Why has our Church, more than almost every other Christian Communion, lost the power of *mission*, of sending, by her own voice and authority, the man whom the place demands, to the place which is waiting for him? It is one of the most serious and radical defects in the working of our modern system. Is it to endure forever? But, while it lasts, it is not amiss to point out to those of our Clergy to whom the suggestion applies, a career of lofty and glorious effort; a career in which they may win for themselves incorruptible crowns for their gold and silver, making to themselves, as is, before all, the duty of the Clergy, when they can, eternal friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.

Second. Leaving now aside the exceptions under which Free Churches have hitherto been commonly maintained, we proceed to show what are the difficulties, (difficulties amounting to impossibilities,) which hinder them from becoming the general method of the American Church. These difficulties will be found to spring, almost wholly, from the want of the primitive features which we at first noticed; namely, the want of jurisdiction, in our Parishes, over any other members of the Church than those who choose to connect themselves with them, and, towards these, the want of any effectual control. These two points, indeed, are *the* difficulty, *the* impossibility; and we cannot better state our second proposition than by repeating, nearly, the words just written: Free Churches cannot be made the prevailing system among us, because only those join them who please, and these do as they please, as to contributing to their support. We acknowledge that the force of

this proposition is not self-evident; but, perhaps, when *shall have finished what we have to say*, it will not be fo*altogether wanting in strength.*

The favorite appeal of the advocates of the Free plan i high principle, to Christian self-denial, to holy charity. (it be possible, they ask, that more can be accomplished tow the temporal support of the Church, by the low and sel and mercenary system of taxation on pews, than by love God and love to man? We do not hesitate to say that i possible. We do not hesitate to say, that pure religious pri ple is not to be relied upon for the support of the temporali of the Church. If it could be relied upon for this, it mi be relied upon for the performance of all other Christian o gations, and ecclesiastical discipline would be unnecess Either there must be law, or some other sort of compuls to secure from Christian worshipers, *general* [illegible] the contri tion of their substance to the maintenance of divine minist tions. What proportion of any congregation is animated such a degree of love to God and man, that they would, fr this sole motive, do their whole duty to the Brotherhood? very small fraction, we fear; and this small fraction is among which, it must be, our Free Churches bear the bur whilst others [illegible] at all. There is yet to be witnes the success of a Free Church in which the *great body* of t congregation contribute *according to their ability*, or anyth approximating to it. It is not [illegible] has the Church relied upon t simple [illegible] of its members for the performa of their ecclesiastical obligations. I were inconsistent wi the principles of the United Brethren as a congregation of t [illegible]. We say, then, that the Fr [illegible] of Christ, because it contradicts [illegible] upon love without h [illegible] human nature in Fr [illegible] and this human nat [illegible] condition, and not upon [illegible] asserted tha [illegible] every congregation [illegible] men, smitten with t

love of Christ and His Poor, who will sacrifice ease and comfort, and pinch themselves in their outlays upon themselves, to give a free Gospel to the needy; and while *they* last in a Free Church, if they are also rich, it may endure. But, to depend upon such for the sustentation of the whole American Communion, is a chimera which can have no practical realization. The vast majority of worshipers in our Churches are not even Communicants; and, of the latter, not one half probably, can be brought, from simple religious principle alone, to do their full duty in a Free Church. For, what is the actual condition of our Free Churches in this particular? It is a point on which we have received very full and convincing testimony. We have never yet met with a Brother who was the Rector of a Free Church, who did not acknowledge to us that he could not induce his people, generally, to do their duty in this matter; he could not bring them, in any considerable number, so to learn the nature of a religious offering, as an act of sacred worship, and so to understand and appreciate the duty of regular systematic offerings in proportion to ability, as to provide in the chosen way of the Free system for all the wants of the House of God. We must remember, also, two important facts that are effectual hindrances in this work. The first is, that many, who are able to do much, resort to Free Churches because they can there follow their disposition to do nothing. We have known men who were living well and prospering in the world, resign their pews in other Churches and join themselves to a Free congregation, to avoid the tax and lessen their expenses. A three cent piece a Sunday, gave them the same privileges in a Free Church as eighty or a hundred dollars a year in a Pew Church. And, with the lax notions prevailing throughout our American community, on the subject of the support of the Ministry, how many there are ready to avail themselves of this miserable subterfuge! None know better than Rectors of Pew Churches, *how* many there are. It is said that a congregation may, in time, be trained into right views and a right practice in this respect. Our second fact, (to which we will presently add a third,) comes in as a grand discouragement,—the fluctuating character of most of our American congregations, which

prevents the only thing that could make the Free plan gener ally successful here, viz., the gradual teaching of the congrega tion to do their duty in the premises, on Christian principle Before it can be done, the congregation with which the worl began, is so far altered by removals, that the teaching has n adequate success. Add to this, (our third fact,) that, of al congregations, those of Free Churches are most given t change, (because, partly, of the facility with which persons i them can come and go,) and there remains very little hope o effecting the work, without which such Churches cannot, gen erally, become and continue self-supporting.

This looseness of the parochial tie in Free Churches is marked effect of the loss of the ancient system. We have n sure hold upon the people. They slip in at their pleasur They need not announce themselves as Parishioners. They ofte do not, especially when they wish to avoid performing the duty to the Church. They may continue in this way for year "running with the machine, but not belonging to the Com pany," as we once heard of one of them expressing it; an then they flit as they came, without notice to anybody. Th abuse of the system by multitudes, is not only a great di couragement; it is, as we mean it to be, an illustration of th radical difficulty in the way of Free Churches in a Communic like that of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in a countr like these United States. It helps to show the futility attempting to restore a mere fragment of the ancient polit without its vital connexions.

We may notice here another difficulty which enforces ou main proposition. In many Free Churches, generally in citie the congregation varies greatly at different seasons of the yea A large part, and those the ablest, are absent in summer. The the stream of offerings runs almo t dry, and unless there some wealthy person to sustain the regular expenditure durin the period of drought, the Parish is in danger of being cripple and the Rector is left to live upon faith. The Church lack the power to secure from the absentees compensation for the Summer deficiencies, by larger offerings on their return; rather, to prevent them, by calling for the Summer suppl

before they leave. They do as they please; and generally the fact is, that the ablest Parishioners aid in the support of the Parish only one half or three quarters of the year. Few are so trained in the system that they will provide their offerings for Summer as for Winter, for absence as for presence; and this makes the life of a Free Church too often like that of a man who lives by his wits, to-day "flush," to-morrow "out of pocket." It is another consequence of the lack of primitive appliances.

Another difficulty arising from the same source, and pointing to the same conclusion, is, that Free Churches, to be self-supporting, cannot do the very work which it is claimed for them, as their special merit, that they alone can do. They cannot minister largely, and in the most efficient manner, to the poor, because they cannot live where the poor are. Place a Free Church in a thoroughly poor district and it must starve. Place it in a rich district, and the poor will not leave their haunts to come to it. Place it in a mixed district, where it may have enough of the rich to support it, and it can do something for the comparatively few poor in its neighborhood. But this is not the work we need; this is not operative upon the neglected masses who are congregated by themselves, forming nearly whole wards, or distinct sections, in our large cities. Free Churches, self-supporting, can never meet the demands of this formidable enterprise. *Mission* Churches may do it; of these we shall speak hereafter. But we have to add here, that seldom can a *Mission Church*, in a poor district, be sustained as an off-shoot of a Free Parish Church in a more favored locality; because, as all experience thus far shows, Free Churches, in the best positions, can rarely do more than support themselves. They can do little to aid others; and most frequently, we may add in passing, they can take little or no part in the great enterprises of the Church. The Weekly Offertory supplies the Parish. That being done, there is seldom a residue for distant charities. Besides, the incessant Offering for itself makes a congregation feel exhausted, when still other calls for offerings are presented. It is difficult to arouse special interest on such occasions; because giving is already continual. We know of the

one or two exceptions to this statement, which we could easi account for, if we were making a point of what we are now sa ing. But it is rather parenthetical, and we speak in the gener

A Free Church must always guard itself against having t large a proportion of poor, lest it beggar itself by excludi those who are able to contribute. It cannot open its doo with perfect freedom to the impoverished masses. Its cler cannot go out into the highways and by-ways, and invite *all* come in. It cannot, even, always provide for the poor imm diately around it, though they be not very numerous. Its fir requisite is to retain a congregation that can support it; f this is its life. Then, what remains may be given to the poo We have seen the experiment made in a Free Church whic stood upon the limit of a poor district. The Rector plunge into the mass of poverty and ignorance, and called upon t people to come to Church. Many listened to the call. The began to frequent the House of God. But the work was soo brought to a sudden end, by the discovery that they were gradu ally displacing the old congregation, and so threatening the ru of the Parish. There was a necessary reaction. Those wh could contribute maintained their places, and the poor intrude fell back into *their* places; where, to this day, they remain, lo in a crowd of immortal beings who are living without hope an without God in the world. The most that a Free Church ca do, is to mingle an ingredient of poverty with the richer mat rial on which the Church depends for its sustenance. Th alone is a laudable work. Nay, it is a glorious sight, which w would see repeated, whenever there are hearts and hands read for it. But the idea which forms the staple of most of th advocacy of Free Churches, that by them, and thus only, th great commission of Christianity to preach the Gospel to th poor may be fulfilled, is a fallacious one. The work must b done for the poor *where the poor are.* We once explored such region. Our missionary went from house to house, and sough out every one who was not connected with any religious Society Of our own Communion alone, chiefly of the Church o England and Ireland, he found no less than one thousan souls, men, women and children, living in utter destitution o

the Means of Grace. We know a land where the sequel would have been *this*,—A Priest would have been sent into the heart of that region; a place of Worship would have been secured. The people would have been called upon to maintain it. They would have obeyed; and out of their poverty, in a humble, yet sufficient manner, the Priest would have been supported, and the spiritual wants of the district supplied. We cannot do that here; and without that, no Free Church can live in such a place. Free Churches, therefore, do not solve the mighty problem, What shall we do with the poor?

Our hold upon Church-members,—the Baptized,—being that only of moral suasion, so far, at least, as the subject in hand is concerned, the great effort of the Rector of a Free Church which is really dependent, or to a considerable degree, upon the congregation at large, must be to secure a sufficient amount of Offerings for carrying on the enterprise. This is a source of perpetual anxiety and toil, wearing, to a fearful degree, upon his energy, consuming his time, requiring incessant appeals and exhortations, distracting his mind from his spiritual functions, —and, generally, with very limited success. The mass of his people cannot be brought to do their duty in the matter. They will not feel it to be a *religious* obligation. They will not place it in the rank of real Christian duty. He can do no more than exhort; which he does, perhaps, till both he and they are weary of the theme. If they do not comply, no one knows it, but each one for himself; and *his* conscience is easy under the neglect. If the Pastor scolds, as he is often tempted to do, it may give offence; and offence given affects the Offerings unfavorably. If the people do not like him they can starve him out, by withholding supplies; and no one knows who did it, excepting each one his own share. This is not fancy. Every Rector of a Free Church knows how much the Offerings of people are affected by their feelings at the moment. If one is displeased for any cause, unless he is of the few who have a real and abiding principle in the matter, his Offering is reduced, or, if he is very much disturbed, ceases entirely. The Rector is not only at the mercy of his congregation once a year, as under the Pew System, but every Sunday. He is in a sub-

jection, therefore, which may at any moment be turned into utter tyranny, dependent, as no other Clergyman is, on mere popular favor. Do we speak of imaginary ills when we say these things? True, we do not in this particular speak from our own experience, excepting only a few individual and insignificant instances.—There are Free Congregations, the most of whose members are too high minded and honorable for such thorough meanness. But we fear those are very few indeed, in which more or less of it is not practiced; and, in all, the immediate dependence of the Clergy upon personal popularity is manifest and necessary. The old law and discipline being lost, Free Churches are left to this most democratic element; and with what arbitary, yet silent and secret power, its sway is enforced, we could relate, in many authentic and atrocious instances. One we will give, as a specimen, selected because it is fresh in our memory, having been detailed to us since we commenced this Article. A Brother in the Ministry, one whose qualities are of a high and sterling character, was called to a Parish. He accepted the invitation, with the understanding, that the Church about to be erected should be Free. His own predilections were in favor of that system, and he entered upon his work with an enthusiasm which many a laborer in the same cause, who recollects his own early zeal in its behalf, will understand. The Church was built. The Weekly Offertory was begun, and continued with fair prospect of permanent success. At length, there entered among the people a cause of difference, in which the Clergyman, in our humble judgment, had the right clearly on his side. There was no disturbance. They yielded, apparently, to his opinion on the question, for it was one of honest contract, and justice was all one way. But they, or at least the most influential and able, were not satisfied, merely because their private wishes were not gratified. Yet no complaint was made; all was smooth and fair outside. Only, the Offerings began to decrease. There followed the usual reminders and exhortations; but without effect. The decline went on; and, in six months, the Rector resigned, to save himself and family from starvation. He was politely dismissed, with the regrets commonly expressed on such occasions; and the Congregation is now seek-

ing for a Rector who will be more submissive and obedient to the wishes of those who give the money. What prevents such practices in any Free Church, under our present parochial system? How many Clergymen can be induced to run the risk of such a treatment? What a convenient method for dismissing old Rectors, of whom the Congregation is getting tired! What a delightful prospect for the Ministry, if such a system should become universal! Keeping a Parish, would require all the cunning and trickery of a modern politician. But, the dignity, and self-respect, and moral power of the Clergy—what of *them*? No; restore the ancient plan entire, and the Freedom of Churches in its place—this is *our* theory. Short of this we advocate no revolutions. On *that* track, we are ready to follow any competent leader.

We must stop here, our work half done, hoping to re-open the discussion in our next, with more particular reference so the Pew System, its uses, its abuses, and the improvements of which it is capable.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.*

JOURNAL

OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY AND LAITY

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

IN A

CONVENTION,

HELD IN

The City of New York, from Tuesday, September 11th, to Wednesday, September 19th, 1792.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

From the State of Rhode Island.

Rev. John Bowden, Samuel Marsh, Esquire.

From the State of Connecticut.

Rev. Abraham Jarvis, D. D., Philip Nichols, Esquire, Theo Belden, Esquire.

From the State of New York.

Rev. Benjamin Moore, D. D., Rev. Abraham Beach, D. D., Thomas L. Moore, Rev. Richard C. Moore, Aquila Giles, Esquire Samuel Martin.

* Continued from Vol. XII, p. 665.

From the State of New Jersey.

Rev. Uzal Ogden, Rev. William Frazer, Rev. Henry Waddell, Hon. Robert Morris, Esquire, Colonel Samuel Ogden, John De Hart, Esquire.

From the State of Pennsylvania.

Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D., Rev. Joseph Pilmore, Rev. Elisha Rigg, John Campbell, Esquire.

From the State of Delaware.

Rev. John Bisset.

From the State of Maryland.

Rev. John Bowie, D. D., Rev. Joseph G. J. Bend, Rev. John Coleman, Colonel John Weems, Major James Lloyd, Dr. John Hindman, Mr. James Howard.

From the State of Virginia.

Rev. Samuel S. M'Croskey, Robert Andrews, Esquire.

From the State of South Carolina.

Rev. Thomas Frost.

JOURNAL, &c.

NEW YORK, *Tuesday, September 11th*, 1792.

CLERICAL and Lay Deputies from the churches in several of the states assembled in Trinity Church, at 10 o'clock A. M., and, after prayers read by the Rev. Thomas L. Moore, judging it proper to wait for the arrival of the Deputies from other churches;

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Wednesday, 10 o'clock, A. M.

The members met and attended divine service performed by the Right Rev. Dr. Madison, and Rev. Dr. Magaw, and a sermon preached by the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury.

After the congregation was dismissed, the members assembled, the Rev. Dr. Smith, the President of the last Convention, in the chair.

The Rev. John Bisset was appointed Secretary pro tempore.

The members proceeded to choose by ballot, a President of the house: and the Rev. Dr. William Smith was elected.

They then proceeded to choose a Secretary by ballot; and the Rev John Bisset was elected.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Mr. Ogden, and Major Lloyd, be a committee to examine the credentials of the members and report thereon.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore, Mr. Andrews, Rev Mr. Frazer, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Marsh be a committee to report rules of order.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this house be given to the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, for his sermon delivered this day in Trinity Church, and that the Rev. Dr. Beach and Robert Andrews Esquire, be appointed to present the thanks of this house, and to request a copy of the sermon for publication.

Ordered, That the Rev. Dr. Beach inform the house of Bishops that this house is now organized, and ready to proceed to business and to receive any communications from them, and to propose 11 o'clock A. M. as the stated hour of meeting.

The Bishops informed the house by their Secretary, that they agree to the hour of ten as the time of meeting.

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Thursday, 10 *o'clock*, *A. M.*

The Rev. John Bisset read prayers.

Ordered, That the Rev. Mr. Ogden inform the Bishops, that seats are prepared for their accommodation on the right hand of the chair whenever they may choose to be present at the debates of the house

The Rev. Dr. Beach, from the committee on the credentials of the members, brought in a report which was read and concurred with.

Resolved, That no person shall be capable of acting as a member of the house of deputies, under the deputation of more than one convention.

In consequence of this resolve, the Rev. John Bisset, who had been reported as elected by the churches in Maryland and Delaware, took his seat as representative of the church of Delaware.

The Rev. John Bowden and Samuel Marsh, Esquire, two of the deputies from the church in Connecticut, having produced a testimonial of their appointment by the church in Rhode Island, took their seats as representatives of that church.

The Rev. Dr. Moore, from the committee for framing rules of order, brought in a report.

Ordered, That it be read.

Ordered, That it be read a second time, and considered by paragraphs.

Accordingly it was read and considered; and the following rules were adopted and ratified:—

I. The business of every day shall be introduced by prayers.

II. When the President takes the chair, no member shall continue standing, or shall afterwards stand up, unless to address the chair.

III. No member shall absent himself from the service of the convention, unless he have leave, or be unable to attend.

IV. When any member is about to speak in debate, or deliver any matter to the Convention, he shall rise from his seat, and, without advancing, shall with due respect address himself to the President, confining himself strictly to the point in debate.

V. No member shall speak more than twice in the same debate, without leave of the House.

VI. A question being once determined, shall stand as the judgment of the Convention, and shall not be again drawn into debate during the same session.

VII. While the President is putting any question, no one shall hold private discourse, stand up, walk into, out of, or across the house, or read any book.

VIII. Every member who shall be in the Convention when any question is put, shall, on a division, be counted, unless he be particularly interested in the decision.

IX. No motion shall be considered as before the House unless it be seconded, and reduced to writing, when required.

X. When any question is before the Convention, it shall be determined on before any thing new is introduced, except the question for adjournment.

XI. The question on a motion for adjournment shall be taken before any other, and without debate.

XII. When the Convention is to rise, every member shall keep his seat until the President leave the chair.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw obtained leave of absence till Saturday morning.

Resolved, That the house now go into a committee of the whole on the state of the church; Rev. Dr. Moore in the chair.

The committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Friday, 10 *o'clock A. M.*

The Rev. Uzal Ogden read prayers.

It appearing to the Convention, that the church in the State of Rhode Island had not acceded to the constitution, but that the deputies from the church in Connecticut were vested by the said church in Rhode Island with full powers to act in all things on their behalf;

Resolved, That the Deputies from the church in Connecticut are authorized to accede to the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in the name and behalf of the church in the state of Rhode Island.

Accordingly, the Clerical and Lay Deputies from the church in Connecticut, subscribed the constitution in the name of the church in Rhode Island.

Satisfactory documents having been laid before the convention, of the appointment of the Rev. Thomas J. Claggett, D. D. to the office of Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Maryland, and also a testimony of the convention of the church in that state, in the form prescribed by the canon;

Resolved, That this house do now proceed to sign the testimony in such cases required from the General Convention.

Accordingly, the said testimony was signed by all the members, and delivered to the Deputies from the church in Maryland, to be presented to the Rev. Dr. Claggett.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore and Colonel Giles, be a committee, to request of the Mayor and Aldermen of New York, the use of two apartments in the City Hall, for the accommodation of the Convention.

The house again resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the state of the church.

The Rev. Dr. Moore, from the committee of the whole, reported, that a motion for ratifying the proposed amendment of the constitution, by which the House of Bishops would be invested with a negative upon the proceedings of the other house, was negatived.

The Rev. Mr. Waddell obtained leave of absence for to-morrow.

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Saturday, 10 *o'clock*, *A. M.*

The Rev. Joseph Pilmore read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Moore reported, that the Mayor and Aldermen had granted the use of two apartments in the City Hall for the accommodation of the two Houses of Convention.

The house adjourned to the City Hall.

Ordered, That Major Lloyd inform the House of Bishops, that this house request a conference with them on the general state of the church, and propose that the Bishops appoint the time and place for holding such conference.

The Rev. Richard C. Moore obtained leave of absence till Monday morning.

It was moved to concur with the resolve of the committee of the whole, on the question respecting the bishops' negative.

The previous question was then moved—Shall the motion for concurrence be now put, and determined in the negative.

On motion, *Resolved*, That it be made known to the several state conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine, in the next General Convention, on the propriety of investing the house of Bishops with a full negative upon the proceedings of the other house.

The house received from the house of bishops, alterations of the office of consecrating bishops, and information that they agreed to enter immediately into conference with the Clerical and Lay Deputies in their house.

The house went into conference with the house of bishops.

After the conference, in which the expediency of considering the articles of religion at this time was discussed,

Resolved, That, as the churches in some of the states are not represented in this Convention, and others only partially, the consideration of the articles of religion be postponed until the next General Convention.

The office of consecration, as altered by the house of bishops, was taken up and read.

It was read the second time, and considered by paragraphs.

Resolved, That it be agreed to and passed.

The house received information from the house of bishops, that they had examined and approved the testimonials of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, bishop elect of the church in Maryland; and that they had appointed half after ten o'clock on Monday morning, as the time for his consecration.

Adjourned to nine o'clock Monday morning.

Monday, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. Dr. Smith read prayers.

The house adjourned to attend divine service in Trinity Church, on occasion of the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, bishop elect of the church in Maryland.

After divine service the house met.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this house be given to the Rev. Dr. Smith, for his sermon delivered this day in Trinity church, and that he be requested to furnish a copy of the same for publication.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the House of Bishops, requesting a conference with them at half after nine o'clock to-morrow.

This message was carried by Major Lloyd, who returned and informed the house, that the Bishops agree to meet the house at the hour proposed.

A letter and copy of proceedings of the Clergy and Laity of the church in North Carolina were laid before the house, expressing their approbation of the proceedings of the last General Convention held in Philadelphia, and their willingness to accede to the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Ordered, That they be preserved by the Secretary among the records of the House.

A letter was received from Mr. Parry Hall, Printer in Philadelphia, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The Rev. Mr. Rigg, and Rev. Mr. Bend, obtained leave of absence for the remaining part of the session.

The House received from the House of Bishops, alterations of the form and manner of ordering Priests, which were read.

Adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

Tuesday, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. Dr. Smith read prayers.

The form of ordering Priests was again read and considered by paragraphs, and with two amendments, was passed.

Ordered, That the House of Bishops be informed thereof by Mr. Bisset; who returned, and reported, that they concurred with the amendments proposed by this House.

The House went into conference with the House of Bishops on the state of the church.

When the Bishops withdrew, the President reported, that the two Houses had agreed to appoint a joint committee to compare the printed edition of the book of common prayer with the original acts of the last General Convention, where they may judge it necessary, and to prepare a mode of authenticating the book by some certain standard and of publishing future editions of the same in the churches in the different states.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Mr. Jarvis, Col. Ogden, John De Hart, Esquire, and Dr. Hindman, be a committee on the part of this House for the above purpose.

The President also reported, that the two houses had agreed to appoint a joint committee for preparing a plan of supporting missionaries to preach the gospel on the frontiers of the United States.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Mr. Bowden, Rev. Mr. M'Croskey, Rev. Mr. Frost, Samuel Marsh, Esquire, Dr. Martin, Major Lloyd, and Mr. Campbell, be a committee on the part of this House for the above purpose.

The Rev. Mr. Frazer, Rev. Mr. Coleman, Mr. Andrews, and Mr. Marsh, had leave of absence after to-morrow morning.

Resolved, That the next meeting of the General Convention be held in the city of Philadelphia; and that the House of Bishops be requested to appoint one of their body to open the Convention with a sermon.

Ordered, That the Rev. Mr. Frost communicate to the House of Bishops the above resolve and appointment of committees.

The House of Bishops informed the House, that they had appointed Bishops Seabury and White, a committee to act in conjunction with the committee appointed by this House, to compare the book of common prayer with the original acts, &c., and Bishops Madison and Claggett a committee to act with the committee appointed for preparing a plan of supporting missionaries, &c.

The House received from the House of Bishops alterations of the form and manner of making Deacons.

Ordered, That they be read.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing this House, that they agreed to the resolve of holding the next meeting of the General Convention in Philadelphia, and that they had appointed the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost to open the Convention with a sermon.

The form of making Deacons was again taken up and considered by paragraphs, and, with some amendments, was agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. Bisset carry it to the House of Bishops, and request their concurrence with the amendments proposed.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they concurred with the amendments proposed to the form of making Deacons.

The house received from the House of Bishops additional canons, and a resolve for printing in one book, the form of ordaining Deacons, Priests, and Bishops.

Ordered, That the canons be read.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Wednesday, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw, from the committee appointed for comparing the printed edition of the book of common prayer, with the original act, &c., brought in a report, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The Rev. Dr. Beach, from the committee appointed for preparing a plan for supporting missionaries, &c., brought in a report, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The additional canons were again taken up, and considered by paragraphs.

Six additional canons were, with amendments, agreed to and enacted; and, with an amendment of the 7th canon, ordered to be sent, by Mr. Bisset, to the House of Bishops, for their concurrence in the amendments of this House.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they concurred with the amendments proposed by this house to the canons, except to the amendment to the 4th.

Resolved, That the house coucur with the resolve of the House of Bishops, for printing in one book, the form of ordaining Deacons, Priests, and Bishops, and that the Rev. Dr. Moore be appointed, on the part of this house, for that purpose.

Resolved, That the house adhere to their amendment of the 4th canon; and that Col. Ogden inform the House of Bishops thereof.

The report of the committee on the Book of common prayer, was again taken up, and considered by paragraphs, and with amendments, sent by the Secretary to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the 4th canon, and agree to the resolve respecting the negative of the House of Bishops.

The report of the committee on the plan for supporting missionaries, &c., was again taken up and considered by paragraphs, and some amendments were proposed and agreed to.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing, that a joint committee be appointed for publishing journals of the two houses, and that the lists of Clergy be printed in an appendix.

The Rev. Dr. Bowie, and Dr. Hindman obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 5 o'clock, P. M.

Five o'clock, P. M.

The house met, and proceeded in the consideration of the report on the plan for supporting missionaries, &c., which was agreed to with amendments; and the Secretary was desired to carry it to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

Ordered, That the presiding Bishop be requested to forward to his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, thirty copies of the journal for his use, and for the use of the Right Rev. the Bishops of England.

The house proceeded to appoint a standing committee, and the following gentlemen were chosen:

For New Hampshire, the Hon. Mr. Livermore.

For Massachusetts, the Rev. Dr. Parker.

For Rhode Island, the Rev. William Smith.

For Connecticut, the Rev. Abraham Jarvis.

For New York, the Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, Richard Harrison, Esquire.

For New Jersey, the Rev. Uzal Ogden, Mr. J. M. Wallace, Colonel Ogden.

For Pennsylvania, the Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Rev. Mr. Pilmore, Hon. Mr. Powell, Dr. Rush, Mr. John Wilcocks.

For Delaware, the Rev. Mr. Thorne, Nicholas Ridgely, Esquire.

For Maryland, the Rev. John Bisset, Major Lloyd.

For Virginia, Rev. Mr. M'Croskey, Robert Andrews, Esquire.

For South Carolina, the Rev. Dr. Smith, Hon. Mr. Izard.

Ordered, That the President of this house is chairman of the above committee, and is empowered to call together the members.

The house of Bishops proposed an amendment to the report respecting missionaries, which was agreed to.

The house proceeded to appoint a committee, for carrying into effect the act respecting missionaries; and the Rev. Dr. Smith, Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Rev. Dr. Andrews, Hon. Mr. Powell, Mr. John Wood, and Dr. Rush, were chosen.

Ordered, That the Secretary inform the House of Bishops thereof.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they agree to the amendment of the 7th canon of the last Convention, and propose that the annexed certificate be altered, to correspond with it; and that the canons, so altered, be published as a canon of this Convention.

Resolved, That the above proposal be agreed to.

The house proceeded to appoint a committee, on the part of this house, for publishing and authenticating the book of common prayer,

agreeably to an act of Convention passed for that purpose; and the Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, and Dr. Johnson were chosen.

Ordered, That the house of Bishops be informed thereof by the Secretary, who reported, that they had appointed the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this house be given to the Mayor and Aldermen of New York for the use of the City Hall; and that the Rev. Dr. Moore and Colonel Giles communicate the same.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, and the Secretary, be a committee on the part of this house, for revising, correcting and publishing the Journals.

Ordered, That one thousand copies of the Journals be printed.

Resolved, That the thanks of the house be given to the President and Secretary for their attention and services.

The house rose.

Signed by order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, President.

Attest. J. BISSET, Secretary.

JOURNAL

OF

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

NEW YORK, *September 11th*, 1792.

THE Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the states of Connecticut and Rhode Island, attended in Trinity Church, at 10 o'clock A. M. and, after prayers,

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Wednesday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The members met: present, the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Right Rev. Dr. Provoost, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New York; Right Rev. Dr. White, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania; and the Right Rev. Dr. Madison, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia.

They then attended divine service. The Right Rev. Dr. Madison read prayers, and the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury preached, agreeably to the appointment of the last General Convention.

After divine service they proceeded to the choice of a Secretary; and the Rev. Samuel Keene was appointed, pro tempore.

The house of Clerical and Lay Deputies informed the Bishops that they were organized, and ready to proceed to business; and that they propose ten o'clock, A. M., as the stated hour of meeting.

The Bishops agreed to meet at the same hour, and desired their Secretary to notify the same to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The Bishops took into consideration the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and, after some deliberation, agreed to postpone the farther consideration thereof till Friday next. Adjourned.

Thursday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The Bishops met, and attended prayers in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The first rule for the government of the house of Bishops, as agreed on at the last Convention, was re-considered.

Resolved, That the said rule be rescinded—that the following be adopted instead thereof, viz:—The office of President of this house shall be held in rotation, beginning from the North; reference being had to the presidency of this house in the last Convention.

In consequence of the above rule, the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost took the chair. Adjourned.

Friday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met: present, the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost, Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Right Rev. Dr. White, and Right Rev. Dr. Madison; and attended prayers in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The house went into the consideration of the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, agreeably to the postponement of Wednesday last.

A message being received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Moore, informing this house, that they had appointed a committee to apply for the use of an apartment in the City Hall; and that, if it meet with the concurrence of this house, application will also be made for another apartment to accommodate the Bishops.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore be requested to inform the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that this house do concur in their proposition.

The house proceeded in the consideration of the form of ordaining or consecrating a Bishop; and, having agreed on sundry alterations of the same, appointed Bishops White and Madison a committee to prepare a draft of the said alterations, to be laid before the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies to-morrow morning. Adjourned.

Saturday morning.

The house met: present, as yesterday.—The Rev. Mr. Keene being obliged to resign the office of Secretary, the Rev. L. Cutting was chosen in his stead.

The house received a message by the Rev. Dr. Moore, that rooms were prepared in the City Hall for the reception of the two houses of Convention.

The house received a message by the Rev. Dr. Beach, asking this house to concur with them in thanking the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury for his sermon delivered at the opening of the Convention, and in requesting a copy of the same to be printed.

Resolved, That this house concurs with the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in thanking the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury for his sermon delivered at the opening of the Convention, and in requesting a copy of the same to be printed.

The Clerical and Lay Deputies from the state of Maryland, presented to this house the Rev. Thomas John Claggett, D. D., as Bishop elect of the church in the said state, requesting that his consecration might be expedited. The said deputies laid before the house the proceedings of the Convention held in Annapolis, in May, 1792, respecting the election of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, together with the certificates required by the 2d canon.

Adjourned to the Senate Chamber in the City Hall, agreeably to the determination of yesterday.

Senate Chamber, City Hall.

The committee reported a draft of the alterations in the consecration service.

The house received a message from the Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, requesting a conference with them on the general state of the Church.

Resolved, That the alterations in the consecration service be sent to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence; and

that they be informed, this house is now ready to meet them in their room on the proposed conference.

The house went into a conference with the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in which the President of this house was requested to take the chair, when the following motion was made :

Agreed, that as the churches in some of the states are not represented in this Convention, and others only partially, the consideration of the articles of religion be postponed until the next General Convention;—which passed in the negative in the house of Bishops, and in the affirmative in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The house having considered the testimonials respecting the election of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, and found them satisfactory,

Resolved, That the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Thomas John Claggett take place on Monday morning at half-past ten.

Adjourned.

Monday morning, nine o'clock.

House met; present, as on Saturday.

The house took under consideration the offices for ordaining Priests and Deacons, and having made some advance therein, proceeded to Trinity Church, to the consecration of the Rev. Thomas John Claggett, D. D., and, after divine service, returned to their house, when the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett took his seat.

A message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, reporting, that they concurred with the house of Bishops in their alterations in the form of consecrating Bishops.

A message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, requesting a conference between the two houses to-morrow morning, at half past nine o'clock.

In consideration of the resolve of the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, respecting the articles, this house agree to postpone the same.

Resolved, That a record of the certificate of the consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett, be entered on the Journals of this house; and that the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestry of Trinity Church, be requested to enter it on their church book.

Resolved, That it be proposed to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to publish, in one book, the form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, conformably to the alterations agreed on between the two houses.

Adjourned till half-past nine to-morrow morning.

Tuesday morning, half-past nine.

House met: present, the Right Rev. Bishops Provoost, Seal White, Madison and Claggett.

The house originated certain canons, and sent them to the hou Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence.

The house received a message by the Rev. Mr. Bisset, from house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, proposing two amendments i office for ordaining Priests; to both which the house agreed.

The house went into a conference with the house of Clerical Lay Deputies. The President of this house was requested to tak chair, in which conference the following propositions were agree

Resolved, That a joint committee be appointed to compare printed edition of the common prayer book with the original ac the last General Convention, where they may judge it necessary; to adopt a mode of authenticating the book by some certain stan and for publishing future editions of the same in the churches o different states.

Resolved, That a joint committee of both houses be appointe report a plan for supporting missionaries to preach the gospel o frontiers of the United States.

Resolved, That the Right Rev. Bishops Seabury and White, committee from this house on the first proposition; and the R Rev. Bishops Madison and Claggett be a committee on the last.

The house received a message from the house of Clerical and Deputies, proposing that the next General Convention be held i city of Philadelphia, and that this house would appoint one of t body to open the Convention with a sermon;

Resolved, That this house agree to the above, and request the R Rev. Bishop Provoost to preach the sermon.

The house originated alterations in the office for ordaining Dea and alterations of the preface, and of the title of the book of or tion and consecration, and sent them to the house of Clerical and Deputies, requesting their concurrence.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Depu amendments to the additions in the office for ordaining Deacons, in the preface; in which the house concurred. Adjourned.

Wednesday, September 19.

The house met: present, as yesterday, except Bishop Claggett

The house received a message from the house of Clerical and Deputies, asking the concurrence of the house in a resolve of th

to the Rev. Dr. Smith, for his sermon delivered before them on the occasion of the consecration of Bishop Claggett, and that he be requested to furnish a copy of the same for publication.

Resolved, That this house do concur in the same. The committee appointed yesterday to compare the printed edition, &c., also the committee appointed to prepare a plan for supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States, made report.

Resolved, That the several members of this house deliver to the Secretary, the lists of the Clergy of their respective dioceses, and that the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies be requested to send to this house the lists from the several states in which there are no Bishops, agreeably to the 16th canon, and that the said lists be printed as an appendix to the journal.

This house received a message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, proposing as follows :

That it be made known to the several state Conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine, in the next General Convention, on the propriety of investing the House of Bishops with a full negative on the proceedings of the other house.

This house concurs in the above, and agrees to the amendment of the 4th canon.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, their concurrence with the proposal concerning the publication of the ordination and consecration services. In that proposal, the President of this house was named on the joint committee by this house, and the Rev. Dr. Moore is appointed on the part of the Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, amendments of the report of the joint committee to compare the printed edition of the prayer book, &c., to which this house agreed, and passed the report.

The House sent information to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that they propose to adjourn to 6 o'clock this evening.

The house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, amendments of the report of the joint committee, on the plan for supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States, to which this house proposed an addition.

The House also received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a proposal of sending journals of this Convention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the purpose of informing his Grace, and the other Prelates of England, of the state and proceedings of this church.

After divine service the house met.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this house be given to the Rev. Dr. Smith, for his sermon delivered this day in Trinity church, and that he be requested to furnish a copy of the same for publication.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the House of Bishops, requesting a conference with them at half after nine o'clock to-morrow.

This message was carried by Major Lloyd, who returned and informed the house, that the Bishops agree to meet the house at the hour proposed.

A letter and copy of proceedings of the Clergy and Laity of the church in North Carolina were laid before the house, expressing their approbation of the proceedings of the last General Convention held in Philadelphia, and their willingness to accede to the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Ordered, That they be preserved by the Secretary among the records of the House.

A letter was received from Mr. Parry Hall, Printer in Philadelphia, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The Rev. Mr. Rigg, and Rev. Mr. Bend, obtained leave of absence for the remaining part of the session.

The House received from the House of Bishops, alterations of the form and manner of ordering Priests, which were read.

Adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

Tuesday, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. Dr. Smith read prayers.

The form of ordering Priests was again read and considered by paragraphs, and with two amendments, was passed.

Ordered, That the House of Bishops be informed thereof by Mr. Bisset; who returned, and reported, that they concurred with the amendments proposed by this House.

The House went into conference with the House of Bishops on the state of the church.

When the Bishops withdrew, the President reported, that the two Houses had agreed to appoint a joint committee to compare the printed edition of the book of common prayer with the original acts of the last General Convention, where they may judge it necessary, and to prepare a mode of authenticating the book by some certain standard, and of publishing future editions of the same in the churches in the different states.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Mr. vis, Col. Ogden, John De Hart, Esquire, and Dr. Hindman, be a mittee on the part of this House for the above purpose.

The President also reported, that the two houses had agreed to ap- t a joint committee for preparing a plan of supporting mission- s to preach the gospel on the frontiers of the United States.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Mr. Bowden, Rev. Mr. Croskey, Rev. Mr. Frost, Samuel Marsh, Esquire, Dr. Martin, Ma- Lloyd, and Mr. Campbell, be a committee on the part of this House the above purpose.

The Rev. Mr. Frazer, Rev. Mr. Coleman, Mr. Andrews, and Mr. sh, had leave of absence after to-morrow morning.

Resolved, That the next meeting of the General Convention be l in the city of Philadelphia; and that the House of Bishops be uested to appoint one of their body to open the Convention with a non.

Ordered, That the Rev. Mr. Frost communicate to the House of hops the above resolve and appointment of committees.

The House of Bishops informed the House, that they had appoint- Bishops Seabury and White, a committee to act in conjunction with committee appointed by this House, to compare the book of com- n prayer with the original acts, &c., and Bishops Madison and ggett a committee to act with the committee appointed for prepar- a plan of supporting missionaries, &c.

The House received from the House of Bishops alterations of the n and manner of making Deacons.

Ordered, That they be read.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing this use, that they agreed to the resolve of holding the next meeting of General Convention in Philadelphia, and that they had appointed Right Rev. Dr. Provoost to open the Convention with a sermon.

The form of making Deacons was again taken up and considered aragraphs, and, with some amendments, was agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. Bisset carry it to the House of Bishops, and uest their concurrence with the amendments proposed.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they concurred n the amendments proposed to the form of making Deacons.

The house received from the House of Bishops additional canons, a resolve for printing in one book, the form of ordaining Deacons, sts, and Bishops.

Ordered, That the canons be read.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Wednesday, 9 o'clock, A. M.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw, from the committee appointed for comparing the printed edition of the book of common prayer, with the original act, &c., brought in a report, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The Rev. Dr. Beach, from the committee appointed for preparing a plan for supporting missionaries, &c., brought in a report, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The additional canons were again taken up, and considered by paragraphs.

Six additional canons were, with amendments, agreed to and enacted; and, with an amendment of the 7th canon, ordered to be sent, by Mr. Bisset, to the House of Bishops, for their concurrence in the amendments of this House.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they concurred with the amendments proposed by this house to the canons, except to the amendment to the 4th.

Resolved, That the house coucur with the resolve of the House of Bishops, for printing in one book, the form of ordaining Deacons, Priests, and Bishops, and that the Rev. Dr. Moore be appointed, on the part of this house, for that purpose.

Resolved, That the house adhere to their amendment of the 4th canon; and that Col. Ogden inform the House of Bishops thereof.

The report of the committee on the Book of common prayer, was again taken up, and considered by paragraphs, and with amendments, sent by the Secretary to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the 4th canon, and agree to the resolve respecting the negative of the House of Bishops.

The report of the committee on the plan for supporting missionaries, &c., was again taken up and considered by paragraphs, and some amendments were proposed and agreed to.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing, that a joint committee be appointed for publishing journals of the two houses, and that the lists of Clergy be printed in an appendix.

The Rev. Dr. Bowie, and Dr. Hindman obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 5 o'clock, P. M.

Five o'clock, P. M.

The house met, and proceeded in the consideration of the report on the plan for supporting missionaries, &c., which was agreed to with amendments; and the Secretary was desired to carry it to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

Ordered, That the presiding Bishop be requested to forward to his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, thirty copies of the journal for his use, and for the use of the Right Rev. the Bishops of England.

The house proceeded to appoint a standing committee, and the following gentlemen were chosen:

For New Hampshire, the Hon. Mr. Livermore.

For Massachusetts, the Rev. Dr. Parker.

For Rhode Island, the Rev. William Smith.

For Connecticut, the Rev. Abraham Jarvis.

For New York, the Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, Richard Harrison, Esquire.

For New Jersey, the Rev. Uzal Ogden, Mr. J. M. Wallace, Colonel Ogden.

For Pennsylvania, the Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Rev. Mr. Pilmore, Hon. Mr. Powell, Dr. Rush, Mr. John Wilcocks.

For Delaware, the Rev. Mr. Thorne, Nicholas Ridgely, Esquire.

For Maryland, the Rev. John Bisset, Major Lloyd.

For Virginia, Rev. Mr. M'Croskey, Robert Andrews, Esquire.

For South Carolina, the Rev. Dr. Smith, Hon. Mr. Izard.

Ordered, That the President of this house is chairman of the above committee, and is empowered to call together the members.

The house of Bishops proposed an amendment to the report respecting missionaries, which was agreed to.

The house proceeded to appoint a committee, for carrying into effect the act respecting missionaries; and the Rev. Dr. Smith, Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Rev. Dr. Andrews, Hon. Mr. Powell, Mr. John Wood, and Dr. Rush, were chosen.

Ordered, That the Secretary inform the House of Bishops thereof.

The House of Bishops informed the house, that they agree to the amendment of the 7th canon of the last Convention, and propose that the annexed certificate be altered, to correspond with it; and that the canons, so altered, be published as a canon of this Convention.

Resolved, That the above proposal be agreed to.

The house proceeded to appoint a committee, on the part of this house, for publishing and authenticating the book of common prayer,

agreeably to an act of Convention passed for that purpose; and th Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, and Dr. Johnson were chosen.

Ordered, That the house of Bishops be informed thereof by th Secretary, who reported, that they had appointed the Right Rev. D Provoost.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this house be given the Mayor and Aldermen of New York for the use of the City Hal and that the Rev. Dr. Moore and Colonel Giles communicate th same.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Beach, and the Secr tary, be a committee on the part of this house, for revising, correcti and publishing the Journals.

Ordered, That one thousand copies of the Journals be printed.

Resolved, That the thanks of the house be given to the Preside and Secretary for their attention and services.

The house rose.

Signed by order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, Presiden

Attest. J. BISSET, Secretary.

JOURNAL

OF

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

NEW YORK, *September* 11*th*, 1792.

THE Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Bishop of the Protestant Episc pal Church in the states of Connecticut and Rhode Island, attend in Trinity Church, at 10 o'clock A. M. and, after prayers,

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Wednesday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The members met: present, the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Rig Rev. Dr. Provoost, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ne York; Right Rev. Dr. White, Bishop of the Protestant Episcop Church in Pennsylvania; and the Right Rev. Dr. Madison, Bishop the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia.

They then attended divine service. The Right Rev. Dr. Madison read prayers, and the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury preached, agreeably to the appointment of the last General Convention.

After divine service they proceeded to the choice of a Secretary; and the Rev. Samuel Keene was appointed, pro tempore.

The house of Clerical and Lay Deputies informed the Bishops that they were organized, and ready to proceed to business; and that they propose ten o'clock, A. M., as the stated hour of meeting.

The Bishops agreed to meet at the same hour, and desired their Secretary to notify the same to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The Bishops took into consideration the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and, after some deliberation, agreed to postpone the farther consideration thereof till Friday next. Adjourned.

Thursday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The Bishops met, and attended prayers in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The first rule for the government of the house of Bishops, as agreed on at the last Convention, was re-considered.

Resolved, That the said rule be rescinded—that the following be adopted instead thereof, viz:—The office of President of this house shall be held in rotation, beginning from the North; reference being had to the presidency of this house in the last Convention.

In consequence of the above rule, the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost took the chair. Adjourned.

Friday, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met: present, the Right Rev. Dr. Provoost, Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, Right Rev. Dr. White, and Right Rev. Dr. Madison; and attended prayers in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The house went into the consideration of the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, agreeably to the postponement of Wednesday last.

A message being received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Moore, informing this house, that they had appointed a committee to apply for the use of an apartment in the City Hall; and that, if it meet with the concurrence of this house, application will also be made for another apartment to accommodate the Bishops.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Moore be requested to inform the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that this house do concur in their proposition.

The house proceeded in the consideration of the form of ordaining or consecrating a Bishop; and, having agreed on sundry alterations of the same, appointed Bishops White and Madison a committee to prepare a draft of the said alterations, to be laid before the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies to-morrow morning. Adjourned.

Saturday morning.

The house met: present, as yesterday.—The Rev. Mr. Keene being obliged to resign the office of Secretary, the Rev. L. Cutting was chosen in his stead.

The house received a message by the Rev. Dr. Moore, that rooms were prepared in the City Hall for the reception of the two houses of Convention.

The house received a message by the Rev. Dr. Beach, asking this house to concur with them in thanking the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury for his sermon delivered at the opening of the Convention, and in requesting a copy of the same to be printed.

Resolved, That this house concurs with the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in thanking the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury for his sermon delivered at the opening of the Convention, and in requesting a copy of the same to be printed.

The Clerical and Lay Deputies from the state of Maryland, presented to this house the Rev. Thomas John Claggett, D. D., as Bishop elect of the church in the said state, requesting that his consecration might be expedited. The said deputies laid before the house the proceedings of the Convention held in Annapolis, in May, 1792, respecting the election of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, together with the certificates required by the 2d canon.

Adjourned to the Senate Chamber in the City Hall, agreeably to the determination of yesterday.

Senate Chamber, City Hall.

The committee reported a draft of the alterations in the consecration service.

The house received a message from the Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, requesting a conference with them on the general state of the Church.

Resolved, That the alterations in the consecration service be sent to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence; and

that they be informed, this house is now ready to meet them in their room on the proposed conference.

The house went into a conference with the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in which the President of this house was requested to take the chair, when the following motion was made :

Agreed, that as the churches in some of the states are not represented in this Convention, and others only partially, the consideration of the articles of religion be postponed until the next General Convention;—which passed in the negative in the house of Bishops, and in the affirmative in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The house having considered the testimonials respecting the election of the Rev. Dr. Claggett, and found them satisfactory,

Resolved, That the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Thomas John Claggett take place on Monday morning at half-past ten.

Adjourned.

Monday morning, nine o'clock.

House met; present, as on Saturday.

The house took under consideration the offices for ordaining Priests and Deacons, and having made some advance therein, proceeded to Trinity Church, to the consecration of the Rev. Thomas John Claggett, D. D., and, after divine service, returned to their house, when the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett took his seat.

A message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, reporting, that they concurred with the house of Bishops in their alterations in the form of consecrating Bishops.

A message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, requesting a conference between the two houses to-morrow morning, at half past nine o'clock.

In consideration of the resolve of the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, respecting the articles, this house agree to postpone the same.

Resolved, That a record of the certificate of the consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett, be entered on the Journals of this house; and that the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestry of Trinity Church, be requested to enter it on their church book.

Resolved, That it be proposed to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to publish, in one book, the form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, conformably to the alterations agreed on between the two houses.

Adjourned till half-past nine to-morrow morning.

Tuesday morning, half-past nine.

House met: present, the Right Rev. Bishops Provoost, Seabury, White, Madison and Claggett.

The house originated certain canons, and sent them to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence.

The house received a message by the Rev. Mr. Bisset, from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, proposing two amendments in the office for ordaining Priests; to both which the house agreed.

The house went into a conference with the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The President of this house was requested to take the chair, in which conference the following propositions were agreed to.

Resolved, That a joint committee be appointed to compare the printed edition of the common prayer book with the original acts of the last General Convention, where they may judge it necessary; and to adopt a mode of authenticating the book by some certain standard, and for publishing future editions of the same in the churches of the different states.

Resolved, That a joint committee of both houses be appointed to report a plan for supporting missionaries to preach the gospel on the frontiers of the United States.

Resolved, That the Right Rev. Bishops Seabury and White, be a committee from this house on the first proposition; and the Right Rev. Bishops Madison and Claggett be a committee on the last.

The house received a message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, proposing that the next General Convention be held in the city of Philadelphia, and that this house would appoint one of their body to open the Convention with a sermon;

Resolved, That this house agree to the above, and request the Right Rev. Bishop Provoost to preach the sermon.

The house originated alterations in the office for ordaining Deacons, and alterations of the preface, and of the title of the book of ordination and consecration, and sent them to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, requesting their concurrence.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, amendments to the additions in the office for ordaining Deacons, and in the preface; in which the house concurred. Adjourned.

Wednesday, September 19.

The house met: present, as yesterday, except Bishop Claggett.

The house received a message from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, asking the concurrence of the house in a resolve of thanks

the Rev. Dr. Smith, for his sermon delivered before them on the asion of the consecration of Bishop Claggett, and that he be re-ested to furnish a copy of the same for publication.

Resolved, That this house do concur in the same. The committee ointed yesterday to compare the printed edition, &c., also the com-ittee appointed to prepare a plan for supporting missionaries to preach Gospel on the frontiers of the United States, made report.

Resolved, That the several members of this house deliver to the cretary, the lists of the Clergy of their respective dioceses, and that house of Clerical and Lay Deputies be requested to send to this use the lists from the several states in which there are no Bishops, reeably to the 16th canon, and that the said lists be printed as an pendix to the journal.

This house received a message from the house of Clerical and Lay eputies, proposing as follows :

That it be made known to the several state Conventions, that it is oposed to consider and determine, in the next General Convention, the propriety of investing the House of Bishops with a full gative on the proceedings of the other house.

This house concurs in the above, and agrees to the amendment of e 4th canon.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, eir concurrence with the proposal concerning the publication of the dination and consecration services. In that proposal, the President this house was named on the joint committee by this house, and e Rev. Dr. Moore is appointed on the part of the Clerical and Lay eputies.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, mendments of the report of the joint committee to compare the print-d edition of the prayer book, &c., to which this house agreed, and ssed the report.

The House sent information to the house of Clerical and Lay Depu-es, that they propose to adjourn to 6 o'clock this evening.

The house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Depu-es, amendments of the report of the joint committee, on the plan r supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the nited States, to which this house proposed an addition.

The House also received from the House of Clerical and Lay Depu-es, a proposal of sending journals of this Convention to the Arch-shop of Canterbury, for the purpose of informing his Grace, and e other Prelates of England, of the state and proceedings of this hurch.

Resolved, That the house concur therein.

The house of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurred in the rep the plan for the support of missionaries, &c., and named the req committee, with which this house agreed.

The house received a proposal from the house of Clerical an Deputies, for printing one thousand copies of the journal; also, a sage as to the mode of authenticating the acts of the Conve This house agreed to the former, and proposed the acts to be au ticated by the signatures of the Presidents of the respective h

The house received a message from the house of Clerical and Deputies, with information, that they had appointed a commit superintend the printing a correct edition of the common prayer requesting that a committee be appointed from this house for the purpose; when Bishop Provoost was accordingly appointed.

A message reporting, that the house of Clerical and Lay De concur with the proposal respecting the 7th canon.

The house received from the house of Clerical and Lay Dep their concurrence to the proposal for printing a list of the Cler an appendix to the journal.

A message was received desiring the concurrence of this hou the appointing a committee for printing their journal, when B Provoost was appointed.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this house be given Rev. L. Cutting, for his services as Secretary.

The house rose.

Signed by order of the House of Bishops.

SAMUEL PROVOOST, Presid

Attest. L. CUTTING, Secretary.

The Certificate of the Consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop gett, is as follows:

KNOW all men by these presents, that we Samuel Provoost, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New presiding Bishop; Samuel Seabury, D. D. Bishop of Connecticu Rhode Island; William White, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant copal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; James son, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the st Virginia; under the protection of Almighty God, in Trinity C in the city of New York, on Monday the seventeenth of Se

ber, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety-two, did then and there rightly and canonically consecrate our beloved in Christ, Thomas John Claggett, D. D., late Rector of St. James' parish in the state of Maryland, of whose sufficiency in good learning, soundness in the faith, and purity of manners, we were fully ascertained, into the office of Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the said State, to which the said Thomas John Claggett hath been elected by the Convention of the said State. In testimony whereof, we have signed our names and caused our seals to be affixed. Given in the city of New York, this nineteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety-two.

SAMUEL PROVOOST, (L. S.)
S. SEABURY, (L. S.)
WM. WHITE, (L. S.)
J. MADISON. (L. S.)

A true copy of the Certificate of the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas John Claggett, as compared with the original, by

LEOC. CUTTING, Secretary of the House of Bishops.
J. BISSET, Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

ADDITIONAL CANONS.

I.

FOR a more full accomplishment of the good purposes to be answered by the 16th canon, enacted by the last General Convention, it is hereby required, that every Clergyman claiming to be a Minister of this church, shall deliver in his name to the Bishop, or if there be no Bishop, to the chairman or some member of the standing committee, of the church in the state in which he resides, on or before Easter Monday, 1793; or, if he be not within any of the states which have acceded to the Constitution of this church, then within three months after he shall come to reside in any of the said states. And every Clergyman, during his neglect of conformity to this canon, shall not be known as a Clergyman of this church, or be admitted to minister in any offices of the same.

II.

If a Clergyman of the church in any diocese or district within this union, shall, in any other diocese or district, conduct himself in such a

way as is contrary to the rules of this church, and disgraceful to his office; the Bishop, or, if there be no Bishop, the standing committee, shall give notice thereof to the Ecclesiastical authority of the diocese or district to which such offender belongs, exhibiting, with the information given, the proofs of the charges made against him.

III.

Whenever a Clergyman shall be degraded, agreeably to the canons of any particular church in the union, the Bishop who pronounces sentence, shall, without delay, cause the sentence of degradation to be published from every pulpit where there may be an officiating minister, throughout the diocese or district in which the degraded minister resided; and also shall give information of the sentence to all the Bishops of this church; and, where there is no Bishop, to the standing committee.

IV.

In regard to the first certificate required in favour of a Bishop elect, by the 2d canon of the last General Convention, and the certificate required in favour of a candidate for Priest's or Deacon's orders, by the 6th canon; if there be any members of the bodies respectively concerned who have not the requisite personal knowledge of the parties, such persons may prefix the following declaration to their signatures:

WE believe the testimony contained in the above Certificate; and we join in the recommendation of A. B. to the office of——— on sufficient evidence offered to us of the facts set forth.

Provided, *That in the case of a Priest or Deacon, two at least of the standing committee sign the same, as being personally acquainted with the candidate.*

V.

No stranger shall be permitted to officiate in any congregation of this church, without first producing the evidence of his being a minister thereof to the minister, or, in case of vacancy or absence, to the church wardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation. And in case any person not regularly ordained shall assume the ministerial office, and perform any of the duties thereof in this church, the minister, or in case of vacancy or absence, the church wardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation where such offence may be committed, shall cause the name of such person, together with the offence, to be published in as many of the public papers as may be convenient.

VI.

No clergyman belonging to this church shall officiate, either by preaching or reading prayers in the parish, or within the parochial cure of another clergyman, unless he have received express permission for that purpose from the minister of the parish or cure, or, in his absence, from the church wardens, vestrymen or trustees of the congregation.

The seventh Canon of the last General Convention, as altered and amended by this Convention.

Of the learning of those who are to be ordained.

NO person shall be ordained in this church, until he shall have satisfied the Bishop, and the two Presbyters by whom he shall be examined, that he is sufficiently acquainted with the New Testament in the original Greek, and can give an account of his faith in the Latin tongue, either in writing or otherwise, as may be required, and that he hath a competent knowledge of moral philosophy, church history, and the belles lettres, and hath paid attention to rhetoric and pulpit eloquence, as the means of giving additional efficacy to his labours; unless it shall be recommended to the Bishop by two-thirds of the State Convention to which he belongs, to dispense with the aforesaid requisition, in whole or in part: which recommendation shall only be for good causes moving thereto, and shall be in the following words, with the signature of the names of the majority of such Convention:

We, whose names are underwritten, are of opinion, that the dispensing with the knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, [or either of the other requisites specified in the seventh canon, as the case may be] in the examination of A. B. for holy orders, will be of use to the church of which we are the Convention, in consideration of other qualifications of the said A. B. for the Gospel Ministry.

Enacted September 19th, 1792.

House of Bishops.

SAMUEL PROVOOST, President.

Attest. L. Cutting, Secretary.

House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, President.

Attest. J. Bisset, Secretary.

An Act of the General Convention, for supporting Missionaries to preach the Gospel on the Frontiers of the United States.

1. RESOLVED, That it be recommended to the ministers of this church to preach a sermon in each of the churches under their care, on the first Sunday of September in every year; and, if that day should not be adapted to the purpose, then on such other Sunday as the minister and vestry or trustees of the congregation shall appoint, for the purpose of collecting money in order to carry into effect this charitable design.

2. That the money so collected, be entered in a record to be kept by the vestries or trustees of each congregation; and by the minister and church wardens or trustees, be delivered to a treasurer appointed by each State Convention, and, by him transmitted to a treasurer who shall be appointed as hereinafter directed.

3. That such Missionaries as may be employed by this church, be authorized to make collections of money from such congregations on the Frontiers as may contribute, and render an accurate account to the Bishop of this church in the state of Pennsylvania, and the standing committee to be appointed by this Convention, of the sums thus collected.

4. That the Bishop of this church in Pennsylvania, and the said standing committee, frame an address to the members of this church, recommending this charitable design to their particular attention; which address shall be read by every minister on the day appointed for the collection.

5. That the Bishop of this church in Pennsylvania, and the said standing committee, have authority to appoint a secretary and a treasurer; the first to carry on the correspondence, and the other to keep the accounts and the moneys of the institution.

6. That when it shall appear to the Bishop of this church in Pennsylvania, and the standing committee to be appointed as aforesaid, that sufficient funds have been provided for the above purpose, they shall then employ such Missionaries, allow such salaries, and make such arrangements, as to them shall seem best; reporting regularly their proceedings to each General Convention.

An Act of the General Convention, for publishing future Editions of the Book of Common Prayer, in the Churches in the different States.

RESOLVED, That a committee be appointed by the General Convention for the purpose of publishing the Book of Common Prayer

and securing the copy-right to them and their assigns, in trust for the Convention; and that this committee be empowered and directed to convey a right to print the book to any printer or printers in any of the states, who may be recommended for that purpose by the State Convention, or their standing committee, free from any premium for copy-right; such State Convention or standing committee to superintend, and correct the press according to the standard book.

☞ *The Rev. J. L. Wilson, Clerical Deputy from the State of North Carolina, having been detained by contrary winds, did not arrive in the city of New York till the 28th instant, the Convention having risen a few days before.*

J. BISSET, Secretary.

APPENDIX.

List of the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, delivered in and published, agreeably to the 16th Canon of the last General Convention.

From *New Hampshire* and *Massachusetts*, no list was delivered in.

Rhode Island.

The Rev. Moses Badger, Rector of King's church, Providence. The Rev William Smith, Rector of Trinity church, Newport.

Connecticut.

The Rev. Ebenezer Dibble, Rector of St. John's church, Stamford. Rev. Geo. Ogilvie, St. Paul's church, Norwalk. Rev. Philo Shelton, Stratfield. Rev. Dr. Bela Hubbard, Trinity church, New Haven. Rev. Philo Perry, Christ church, Newtown. Rev. David Perry, Reading, &c. Rev. —— Marsh, New Milford. Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, Litchfield. Rev. Ambrose Todd, Symsbury. Rev. Abraham Lynsen Clarke, Huntington. Rev. Dr. Richard Mansfield, Derby. Rev. Reuben Ives, Cheshire. Rev. Dr. Abraham Jarvis, Christ church, Middletown. Rev. Daniel Fogg, Brooklyn. Rev. John Tyler, Christ church, Norwich. Rev. — Prindle, Westbury. Rev. John Bowden, residing at Stratford. Rev. Edward Blakslee, Deacon, Woodbridge. Rev. Solomon Blakslee, Deacon, East Haddam. Rev. David Belden, Deacon, ———. Rev. Seth Hart, Deacon, Waterbury. Rev. David Butler, Deacon, North Guilford.

New York.

Rev. Jeremiah Leaming, D. D. residing in New York. Rev. Abraham Beach, D. D. Assistant Minister of Trinity church, New York. Rev. Benjamin Moore,

D. D. Assistant Minister of Trinity church, New York. Rev. Thomas L. Moor Rector of St. George's church, South Hempstead. Rev. Thomas Ellison, Rect of St. Peter's church, Albany. Rev. Richard C. Moore, Rector of St. Andrew church, Staten Island. Rev. Daniel Foote, Rector of the United churches Rye and White Plains. Rev. George H. Spierin, Rector of the United church at Newburgh and Wallkill. Rev. Elias Cooper, Rector of St. John's churc Philipsburgh. Rev. Andrew Fowler, Rector of the United churches at Peek Kill and Highlands. Rev. Theodosius Bartow, Rector of the church at Ne Rochelle. Rev. William Hammel, Rector of the United churches at Jamaic Newtown and Flushing. Rev. —— Hull, Rector of the church at Brookly Rev. Ammi Rogers, Rector of the United churches at Schenectady and Ball town. Rev. —— Bostwick, officiates every third Sunday at Hudson. Re James Nicholls, officiates every third Sunday at Camden. Rev. Daniel Barb officiates every third Sunday at Kingsbury. Rev. Elisha D. Rattoone, Profess of the Greek and Latin languages in Columbia college. Rev. Samuel Nesbi residing in New York.

New Jersey.

Rev. Uzal Ogden, Rector of Trinity church, Newark. Rev. Samuel Spragg Rector of St. John's church, Elizabethtown. Rev. Henry Van Dyke, Recto of St. Peter's church, Amboy, and Christ church, New Brunswick. Rev. Henr Waddell, Rector of Christ church, Shrewsbury, and Christ church, Middletow Rev. Levi Heath, Rector of St. Mary's church, Burlington. Rev. William Fraze Rector of St. Michael's church, Trenton, and St. Andrew's church, Amwel Rev. John Croes, Rector of ————'s church, Swedesburgh. Rev. Samu Gray, Rector of ————'s church, Salem. Rev. William Ayres, Rector of S Peter's church, Spotswood.

Pennsylvania.

Rev. William Smith, D. D. Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D. Rector of St. Paul church, Philadelphia. Rev. John Andrews, D. D. Vice Provost of the Universi of Pennsylvania. Rev. Robert Blackwell, D. D. Assistant Minister of Chris church, and St. Peter's in the city of Philadelphia. Rev. Joseph Hutchins, D. Rev. John Campbell, Rector of the churches in York and Huntington. R Joseph Pilmore, Assistant Minister of St. Paul's church, Philadelphia. R Slator Clay, Rector of St. David's, Radnors', St. Peter's in the Valley, and James's, Perkiomen. Rev. Elisha Rigg, Rector of St. James's, Lancaster. R Joseph Clarkson. Rev. Robert Ayres, Rector of the Episcopal churches in R stone, and the parts adjacent. Rev. Francis Reno, Deacon in Westmorela county. Rev. Joseph H. Turner, Deacon in the churches of Chester, Marc Hook and Concord. Rev. Joseph Doddridge, Deacon in Washington county.

Delaware.

Rev. Robert Clay, Emanuel church, New Castle county. Rev. Sydenh Thorne, Christ church, Kent county. Rev. William Skelly, Christ church, S sex county.

Maryland.

Rev. ——— Brooke, St. Mary's county. Rev. John W. Compton, William a Mary parish; Rev. John Weems, Port Tobacco parish; Rev. Hatch Dent, Tri

ty parish, Charles county. Rev. Joseph Messenger, St. John's parish; Henry Moscrop, St. Anne's parish, Prince George's county. Rev. Edward Gault, Christ church parish; Rev. Thomas J. Chew, All Saints parish, Calvert county. Rev. Thomas J. Claggett, D. D. St. James's parish; Rev. Walter M'Pherson, All Hallows parish; Rev. Ralph Higinbotham, St. Anne's parish; Rev. Mason L. Weems, St. Margaret's, Westmoreland parish, Anne Arundel county. Rev. Thomas Read, Prince George's parish, Montgomery county. Rev. George Bower, All Saints parish; Rev. Townshend Dade, Frederick county. Rev. Joseph G. J. Bend, St. Paul's parish; Rev. William Duke, Baltimore county. Rev. John Coleman, St. John's parish; Rev. John Ireland, Harford county. Rev. John Bisset, St. Stephen's parish, Cecil county. Rev. Archibald Walker, Chester parish; Rev. Colin Ferguson, St. Paul's parish, Kent county. Samuel Keene, D. D. St. Luke's parish; Rev. Samuel Keene, jun. St. Paul's parish; Rev. Owen F. Magrath, Christ church parish, Queen Anne's county. John Bowie, D. D. St. Michael's parish; Rev. James Conner, St. Peter's parish, Talbot county. Rev. Thomas Gordon, St. Mary's, White Chapel parish, Carolina county. Rev. James Kemp, Great Choptank parish, Dorchester county. Rev. George Dasheill, Stepney parish; Hamilton Bell, Somerset parish; Rev. Samuel Tingley, Coventry parish, Somerset county. Rev. John White, All Hallows parish, Worcester county. Rev. Thomas Scott, one of the tutors of St. John's College.

Virginia.

Rev. Isaac Darneille, Rector of Amherst parish. Rev. Alexander Hay, Rector of Antrim parish. Rev. Devereux Jarratt, Rector of Bath parish. Rev. Hugh Corrans Boggs, Rector of Berkeley parish. Rev. Price Davies, Rector of Brisland parish. Rev. John Cameron, Rector of Bristol parish. Rev. John Iredeall, Rector of Broomfield parish. Rev. Alexander M'Farland, Rector of Brunswick parish. Rev. John Bracken, Rector of Bruton parish. Rev. Samuel Shield, Rector of Charles parish. Rev. Samuel Klug; Rev. David Ball, Christ church parish. Rev. James Elliott, Rector of Cople parish. Rev. James Craig, Rector of Cumberland parish. Rev. Needler Robinson, Rector of Dale parish. Rev. Spence Grayson, Rector of Dettingen parish. Rev. Jesse Carter, Rector of Drysdale parish. Rev. Henry Skyrin, Rector of Elizabeth city parish. Rev. James Whitehead, Rector of Elizabeth River parish. Rev. Brian Fairfax, Rector of Fairfax parish. Rev. Alexander Balmain, Rector of Frederick's parish. Rev. Matthew Maury, Rector of Fredericksville parish. Rev. James Craig, Rector of Hamilton's parish. Rev. John Buchanan, Rector of Henrico parish. Rev. Samuel S. M'Croskey, Rector of Hungar's parish. Rev. James Thompson, Rector of Leed's parish. Rev. Charles Crawford, Rector of Lexington parish. Rev. Elkanah Talley, Rector of Littleton parish. Rev. Isaac Wm. Gibern, Rector of Lunenburg parish. Rev. Anthony Walke, Rector of Lynhaven parish. Rev. William Cameron. Rector of Manchester parish. Rev. John J. Spooner, Rector of Martins Brandon parish. Rev. William Hubard, Rector of Newport parish. Rev. Henry J. Burgess, Nottoway parish. Rev. Robert Buchan, Rector of Overwharton parish. Rev. Arthur Emerson, Rector of Portsmouth parish. Rev. John Brunskill, Rector of Raleigh parish. Rev. Alexander Lundie, Rector of St. Andrew's parish. Rev. John Matthews, St. Anne's parish. Rev. James Morris, Rector of St. Bride's parish. Rev. Reuben Clopton, Rector of St. David's

parish. Rev. William Vere; Rev. John Woodville, Rector of St. George's parish. Rev. Charles Hopkins, Rector of St. James Northam parish. Rev. James Price, Rector of St. John's parish. Rev. Joseph Gurley, Rector of St. Luke's parish. Rev. Archibald Dick, Rector of St. Margaret's parish. Rev. James Stevenson, Rector of St. Mark's parish. Rev. Peter Nelson, St. Martin's parish. Rev. Abner Waugh, Rector of St. Mary's parish. Rev. William Stewart, Rector of St. Paul's parish. Rev. Benjamin Blagrove, Rector of St. Peter's parish. Rev. Thomas Davis, Rector of St. Stephen's parish. Rev. John Hyde Saunders, Rector of Southam parish. Rev. Andrew Sim, Rector of South Farnham parish. Rev. Samuel Butler, Rector of Southwark parish. Rev. James Taylor, Rector of Suffolk parish. Rev. Lee Massey, Rector of Truro parish. Rev. James Henderson, Rector of Westover parish. Rev. James Maury Fontaine, Rector of Ware parish. Rev. John Bryan, Rector of Wicomico parish.

South Carolina.

Rev. Dr. Smith, Rev. Mr. Frost, Rev. Dr. Purcell, Rev. Dr. Gates, Rev. Mr. Jenkins, Rev. Mr. Nixon, Master of an Academy, Rev. Mr. White, Charleston. Rev. Mr. Mills, St. Andrews. Rev. Mr. Ellington, St. James's, Goose Creek. Rev. Mr. M'Culley, St. Luke's. Rev. Mr. Tate, St. Helen's. Rev. Mr. Sykes, Prince George's. Rev. Mr. Blackwall, Rev. Mr. Ireland, St. Bartholomews. Rev. Mr. Graham, Edisto.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCES OF THE TRUTH OF THE SCRIPTURE RECORDS, Stated Anew, with Special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times, in Eight Lectures delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, in the year 1859, on the Bampton Foundation. By George Rawlinson, M. A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. From the London Edition, with the *Notes* translated by the Rev. A. N. Arnold, Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1860, 12mo. pp: 454.

We call special attention on the part of our readers to another volume of Bampton Lectures. Both the present Lectures, and those of Mr. Mansel a year before, mark a new era in the history of religious controversy. Mr. Mansel aimed a blow, and a deadly blow too, at the Modern German Philosophy, attacking it boldly upon its own chosen grounds, and exposing its self-contradictions, gross inconsistencies, and absurdities. Whether he has not sometimes left himself open to attack in his own philosophy, is another question; and one which the reader will find discussed on our previous pages. Mr. Rawlinson proposed to himself a different task. German Neology which, in so large a measure, pervades English and American Literature, has set itself to undermine all faith in the historical character of the Old and New Testament, to a much wider and more alarming extent than is generally believed. Such writers as Strauss and DeWette, and others of that School, have led the popular mind in this country to regard the Bible as a mere myth, or fable, destitute of historical fidelity. Mr. Rawlinson's familiarity with recent cuneiform and hieroglyphical discoveries, and with the results in deciphering the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Egyptian records, and his confirmed conviction of "the thorough truthfulness and faithful accuracy of the historical Scriptures," have induced him to "endeavor to exhibit clearly and forcibly the argument from the positive agreement between Scripture and profane history." To cover the whole ground of historical evidence, internal and external, within the compass of Eight Lectures, and with the thoroughness with which Lardner, and Shuckford, and Prideaux, and Paley have examined particular points of enquiry, is of course not to be expected. But the use which he has made of recent discoveries so wonderfully corroborative of the sacred narrative, his re-statement of the whole argument in its bearing upon the infidelity of our times, and at the same time the learning, the thoroughness, and the candor of his investigations, render his work eminently adapted to the wants of the age, and can not fail to make it extremely useful. The Notes which, in amount of matter, fill one-half the volume, and which, in the English edition, are in foreign languages, mostly Greek, in the American reprint are carefully translated. There is so much of this noisy, conceited, bitter infidelity all about us, and masqued too, under a pretentious candor, that there is not one of our readers who ought not to be prepared to expose its ignorance, and rebuke its impudence. We cannot make these men love the truth, but we can, at least, shut their mouths, and so protect the simple and unwary.

CHRISTIAN BELIEVING AND LIVING. SERMONS. BY F. D. HUNTINGTON, D. D., Preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard College. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 528.

In a late No. of this Review we took occasion to examine somewhat at length the "New Liturgy in Harvard University," of which the Rev. Dr. Huntington was the compiler. We could not resist the conviction at that time, that Dr. Huntington could not long remain where he then was; that he was in a transition state; but where he would finally find rest, was more than we ventured to predict. Our uncertainty was the greater on this point from the fact, that his dissatisfaction with Congregational Unitarianism evidently seemed to spring, not so much from its want of historical continuity from that Church which has the promise of perpetuity and of Christ's ever-abiding presence and blessing; not so much from its want of essential agreement with the Apostolic Church in all the true Notes of such a Church; but rather from the fact that Unitarianism was untrue to the wants of his own spiritual nature and being; that it utterly fails to respond to great questions which the soul cannot but ask, and always does ask when enlightened by the Holy Spirit to see and feel its own needs. At the same time, Dr. Huntington's reading had brought him into contact and even communion, with so much of true Catholic teaching, and his own nature was already so well attuned to those expressions of true devotion which are the heritage of the Church, that we feel that even upon this ground there is but one place where he can long be satisfied, and where he can live and labor freely and heartily for our Blessed Lord. That he could not find a home in the Romish Church we regarded as certain. Its converts are made of different stuff. Dr. Huntington has, we understand, already been admitted into communion with what we believe to be a true branch of the Catholic Church, and the truest type of what the Church was in her days of primitive power and glory. We cannot resist the conviction that the accession of such men as DOD, and COOLIDGE, and HUNTINGTON to our ranks is only another proof that the Church is indeed girding herself with power and might for such a work as angels might covet, and as no Church ever, in all time, had opportunity to do before. With much among us that will disgust and repel, possibly astound him, much of mere cant, much of the dry and dead ecclesiasticism of the last half century, we assure him that there are multitudes of hearts—and these steadily increasing in number—fully prepared to respond to all that he has felt, and conceived of, and longed for, as necessarily belonging to CHRIST'S Mystical Body.

Of the Sermons which make up the volume before us, we cannot now speak at length. Of the necessary coherence and essential character of those great Doctrines, which the Scriptures reveal, which the Early Church taught, which the Apostolic and Nicene Symbols embody, and which the Church in the "ages all along" has borne witness to; of all this, Dr. Huntington is fully and deeply conscious. But these truths are not held by him as abstract propositions; or as the dry bones of a metaphysical System of Divinity. Indeed, there is so much of the inner life of the soul in several of these Sermons, so much which reminds one of the best thoughts of another age, that they will be read and reread by multitudes with satisfaction and profit. We refer the reader, especially, to Sermon XI, "Christian Loneliness," to Sermon XVIII, "Christ our Prophet, Priest and King;" and to Sermon XIX, "The Cross a burden or a glory."

CHRIST IN HISTORY. BY ROBERT TURNBULL, D. D. New and revised Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 540.

This work of Dr. Turnbull has certain marked excellencies, and, in our judgment, certain fundamental defects. The author is a man of very considerable reading; he writes in a vivacious style, he takes broad and comprehensive views of his subject, and to the better class of general readers his volume will be attractive. It is altogether above the average range of the popular religious literature of the day. Its great fault is the very opposite of that of Bossuet. He saw everything in history from the stand-point of the Romish Church; with Mr. Turnbull, "Christ in History," is "Christianity in its interior relations and vital energies," "the presence of God, through Jesus Christ, among men, renovating the hearts of individuals and preparing the transformation of Society." Thus Bossuet loses sight of the individual in the Church; Mr. Turnbull loses sight of the Church in the individual. And both are equally mistaken, though in opposite directions, as to what the Church is, as well as to its position, province, &c. But it is a striking fact, that men of all Creeds, and men of no Creed, Romanists, and Rationalists, and Baptists, are all catching this key-note, that there is a unity in history; a plan; an unconscious, gradual, yet sure development of a great central Truth; that from the earliest dawn of time down to the present day, events seem to converge : round and hang upon one central point. To illustrate the truth, that that point is "God in Christ," is Mr. Turnbull's object. Of course it is a great subject, and his work is cursory and superficial, and colored too, at times, by his own peculiar views, and therefore not always to be relied upon; but it is well worth reading.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA. A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859. Vol. VIII. Fugger—Haynau. 8vo. pp. 788.

Many of the articles in this volume are fresh, original, written, not by that bane of the country, professional book-makers, but by men of character, abundantly competent to make this what it ought to be, a great national standard work.

NEW AND ELEGANT EDITION OF COOPER'S NOVELS.

W. A. Townsend & Co., of New York, have published three more Volumes of this new and beautiful illustrated edition of the Novels of J. Fenimore Cooper. They are as follows: THE WATER WITCH: or The Skimmer of the Seas. 12mo. pp. 462. THE SEA LIONS: or The Lost Sealers. 12mo. pp. 490. HOMEWARD BOUND: or The Chase. A Tale of the Sea. 12mo. pp. 532.

We shall have something to say of Cooper as a Novelist and a Moralist, by and by.

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE FORMATION OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1859. 8vo. pp. 250.

A question has been lately raised of a good deal of importance, and one on which the national heart of our country is sufficiently sensitive. It is as to the agency of Alexander Hamilton in the production of Washington's State Papers.

The Hon. Horace Binney, of Philadelphia, has lately taken up this question, so far as Washington's Farewell Address is concerned; and the result of his labors is contained in the volume before us. We do not hesitate to say that he has settled the question for all time. He brought to the examination not only the rarest, but the requisite qualifications for such an undertaking; maturity of judgment, habits of the strictest logical accuracy, a profound veneration for and due appreciation of the character of both these illustrious men, and the opportunity of consulting some documents which neither of the biographers of Washington has had access to. Mr. Binney's argument is thoroughly exhaustive, and his conclusion seems to us inevitable and final. We cannot follow him in his method of proof, but nearly all the papers bearing upon the subject are given in the course of the "Enquiry," or in the Appendix. The result to which Mr. Binney comes in respect to the "Farewell Address," is this; "The main trunk was Washington's, the branches were stimulated by Hamilton, and the foliage, which was not exuberant, was altogether his; and he, more than Washington, pruned and nipped off with severe discrimination whatever was excessive, that the tree might bear the fruits that Washington desired, and become his full and fit representative." It is a beautiful and touching sight, to see a venerable man, in the calm, serene, yet clear sunlight of a closing day, thus re-arranging, gracefully, tenderly, and truthfully, the chaplets which an admiring people have woven to the memory of the heroes of the Republic. It is precisely such a labor as the spirits of these great men would contemplate with grateful satisfaction.

THE SUPREMACY AND OBLIGATION OF CONSCIENCE. Considered, with reference to opposite Errors of Romanism, and Protestantism. By the Rev. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Annunciation. New York: I Dana. 1860. pp. 61.

A careful treatise on Conscience, by so clear-headed a man as Dr. Seabur deserves more than a passing notice; for really the whole subject is practically o of the greatest, if not the greatest question of our day. The first Sermon w occasioned by the return of the Rev. Dr. Forbes to the Church, with the testim ny that by the Romish sect "the private conscience is often violated, and one forced by silence at least to acquiesce in what is opposed to moral truth and j tice." This charge has been so often and so overwhelmingly sustained agai that corrupt communion, that it cannot intelligently be denied. That Rome nihilates the Conscience, and teaches men to break every positive Command of Decalogue, Mr. Meyrick proved beyond a peradventure in his review of Ligu the great Romish saint and Canonist. A similar feat of jugglery has been lat performed by Cardinal Wiseman, to which we may refer hereafter.

If Rome, however, is guilty of destroying the individual conscience, so Ul Protestantism errs equally in another direction, and yet comes to the same sult in respect to the commands of God, only in another way. Thus extre meet. It does not make too much of Conscience, but it thoroughly pervert by ignoring its normal healthful conditions. To expose this specious and n chievous tendency, so current in these days, is the object of Dr. Seabury in second Sermon.

What Conscience is; that it is a Law; what are its appointed guides? these are the important points which Dr. Seabury discusses, and in their relations to matters both of Church and State. The subject, not only practically, but theoretically, is a great one; and we cannot even touch it, or say more than what we have already said, without encountering questions, and theories, and principles, which have riven Society to pieces and engaged the keenest dialecticians of every age.

THE TREASON OF CHARLES LEE, MAJOR GENERAL, SECOND IN COMMAND IN THE AMERICAN ARMY OF THE REVOLUTION. By GEORGE H. MOORE, Librarian of the New York Historical Society. New York: Charles Scribner. 1860.

Mr. Moore—the accomplished Librarian of the New York Historical Society, to whose zeal, energy and good judgment, the Society owes so much—has made an original contribution to our history, of extraordinary interest. It clears up the painful doubts, which rested on the honor and good faith of Washington's second in command, into the more painful but undeniable certainty of his deliberate treachery to the cause he had espoused.

Mr. Moore has become possessed of several documents in relation to that remarkable man, never yet published; and among them a manuscript in Gen. Lee's own hand writing, endorsed in the hand writing of Henry Strachey, Secretary to the Royal Commissioners, Lord and Sir William Howe, in which he has drawn out for them a plan for putting an end to the Revolutionary War by the subjugation of the country to the British arms. Of this treasonable document he gives us a fac-simile, accompanied by such notices of Lee previously to his entering the service of his country, and of his capture and imprisonment by the British, as serve for all needful elucidation of the subject. He reserves, however, the story of Lee's conduct at Monmouth, and his trial after that affair, for a larger work, to contain a more complete account of Lee's life. Meantime he gives us this part of the results of his investigations and discoveries, demonstrating beyond all question the fact of Lee's treason. He has most creditably accomplished the task he proposed to himself, proving—what all who knew him well were aware of—his eminent fitness for those investigations into our history to which he has devoted so much attention.

We have of course spoken of this work on the supposition that this MS., purporting to be in the hand writing of Gen. Lee, is a genuine document. Yet the volume itself tells us nothing of its history.

THE WHITE HILLS; THEIR LEGENDS, LANDSCAPE, AND POETRY. By THOMAS STARR KING; with Sixty Illustrations, engraved by Andrew, from Drawings by Wheelock. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1860. pp. 403.

Why did not the author give "The White Mountains" as the title to his book? Then every body would have known what he meant. In all really great objects, whether in Nature or Art, there is a certain "*genius loci vel rei*," as the ancients had it, to which the beholder must be attuned, or he is disqualified to gaze upon them. We make this remark, because it explains forcibly the character of this work on "The White Mountains" of New Hampshire. The author has lingered around these mighty works of nature with an eye and an ear open

to their varied beauty and grandeur and music; and we have in this volume, also interspersed, beautifully executed landscape views, illustrating the author's descriptions. He describes minutely the Four Valleys, Lake Winnipiseogee, the Pemigewasset Valley, and Franconia, the Saco Valley and Cho-corua, the Notch and its Vicinity, the Androscoggin Valley, the Glen, the Ascent of Mount Washington, and the Connecticut Valley. Two papers also are contributed by Professor Tuckerman. There are, also, poetical selections from the works of Bryant, Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, Lowell, Percival, Wordsworth, Scott, Tennyson, Goethe, Shelley, and Byron; not intended for mere ornament, but to continue and complete the description attempted, or to embody the predominant sentiment of the landscape. It is in all respects an elegant volume, and will be appreciated by those who are capable of enjoyment from such sources.

THE DIARY OF A SAMARITAN. By a Member of the Howard Association of New Orleans. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 324.

This volume will introduce the reader, especially if he knows nothing of New Orleans from personal observation, to phases of life which will be new to him. In several respects New Orleans is unlike almost any other city on the continent. In the strange blending of nationalities in the people who make up its population; in the entire absence, on the part of multitudes, of everything like home influences; in the freedom from conventional usages and restraints, and the stern reality and boldness with which both vice and Christian virtue publicly appear; in the frankness and manliness, the utter absence of all prevarication and disguise in the manners of the people; in the readiness and munificence of individual and public charities; in all these respects the contrast between New Orleans and a Northern city is marked. It only needs the presence of some event powerful enough to reveal the inner life of such a people, to show an individuality and intensity of character, such as can hardly be found any where else. The "Howard Association" grew out of such an emergency, when a fearful epidemic swept with awful destruction over the city. One of its Members, a "good Samaritan" indeed, in his "Diary" gives a record of his observations and his experience during that fearful visitation; such as will stir the heart's blood of any reader.

GEOLOGY: for Teachers, Classes, and Private Students. By SANFORD TENNEY, A. M., Lecturer on Physical Geography, etc., in the Massachusetts Teachers' Institutes. Illustrated with Two Hundred Wood Engravings. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 320.

For an accurate knowledge of what Geology really is, a clear statement of its principles, a classified arrangement of its facts, and a scientific definition of its terms, we know of no elementary work so thoroughly satisfactory as this. Somebody has recently published a book in New York maintaining that when God formed the Earth He made it just as it now appears to us, fossils, plants, animals and all. We have ourselves seen borings from Artesian Wells, taken hundreds of feet beneath the earth's surface, and two hundred miles from the Gulf of Mexico, which we think would stagger the author, unless his bump of credulity is uncommonly large. As a text-book for Schools, the work before

: best that has yet appeared. The tone of the book is orthodox. The el theory of Development, the author rejects, not only as a thoroughly scic man, but as a believer in Revelation. The Book of Nature and the Book evelation have the same Author; and the results of true Science are provhis conclusively.

P-HELP: With Illustrations of Character and Conduct. By SAMUEL SMILES, uthor of the "Life of George Stephenson." New York: Harper & Brothers. 360. 12mo. pp. 363.

'e have not lately seen a book better calculated to stir the hearts of the few, especially the few among the young who have the real elements of power in n. The great mass of men, and women too, are after all, like the great mass ooks, really very much alike. We do not of course mean morally. When you e seen one you have seen them all. They look alike, think alike, talk alike, alike, dress alike. Of course to raise this mass of mediocrity to a higher ndard of excellence, is a duty. But the select few whom God has endowed h a strong individuality, a capacity for high excellence, these will be incited the work before us, to that moral daring and indomitable perseverance which necessary to elevate themselves above the common level which most men contented with. The illustrations are numerous and pertinent. The old rseman's ancient crest of a pickaxe, with the motto: "Either I will find a y or make one," is, after all, the motto of every young man who rises to tinction.

E QUEEN OF HEARTS. By WILKIE COLLINS, author of "The Dead Secret," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 472.

EACHERS AND PREACHING. By NICHOLAS MURRAY, D.D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 303.

This volume contains some very good hints about both preachers and preachg; but we think we have never seen, in a single volume from any man, nomilly Christian, statements made with more deliberate recklessness. How an telligent man dare write so respecting the Church, is a mystery to us. Here re a few specimens out of many: "There is not any authority in the Scriptures r bishops at all, in the sense of the theory." "*The theory has no foundation the New Testament, nor in the conduct of the Apostles.*" "*In the ages mediately subsequent to that of the Apostles, presbyters ordained presyters,*" &c., &c. Will the Rev. Dr. Murray please bear in mind that this is not e statement of an opinion, but of what he alleges to be a historic fact? Will he lease note that we here, and now, openly and unqualifiedly deny that statement? 'e call for the facts as to those Ordinations—When? Where? Who? by whom? 'here recorded? Dr. Murray, give us your authorities, or retract your statents. The tone and temper of the man correspond very well with his history.

PRONOUNCING BIBLE, &c., with Copious references, and marginal readings, together with Introductions to each Book, and Numerous Tables and Maps. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860. 8vo. pp. 1017.

Messrs. Carlton & Porter are publishing a great number of religious books r the especial use of the Methodists; and such is the despotism of that system,

and the efficiency of their drill, that their Book Concern is said to "
This "Pronouncing Bible," although evidently, a second-hand, and s
thing, is a move in the right direction. We have heard of a Meth
"publicly pronounced *Samothracia, Samthrasher*, and lost his cred
a nickname for it." We never heard anything quite equal to that in t
but we have heard *hemmings* and *hawings*, which showed to the co
plainly enough, that the clergyman was attempting to read what he w
to read correctly. The time has gone by in the Church for all that
nunciation of proper names in this volume is not always given correct
it is generally, as far as we have examined it.

DOCTOR OLDHAM AT GREY STONES, AND HIS TALK THERE. O. O. 1
D. Appleton & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 342.

This "Doctor Oldham" is a most merciless phlebotomist; and i
judge from the wincings and contortions in certain quarters, he is d
produce a sensation. We do not quite like everything in the Doctor, l
age of quacks and shams, of impudence and self conceit, it is refreshi
a while to see the impostor unmasked, and his nostrums labelled by
names. The first edition was sold off within a fortnight. We shall g
of the book and some criticisms upon it, in our next Number.

THE ANNUAL OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY; OR, YEAR-BOOK OF FACTS I
AND ART; exhibiting the most important discoveries and improveme
chanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Me
Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Geology, Geography, Antiquities, etc
with Notes on the progress of Science during the year 1859; a List
Scientific Publications; Obituaries of eminent Scientific Men, &c
by David A. Wells, A. M., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 186
pp. 430.

The title page describes exactly the contents of this volume, whic
up of the results of the very latest discoveries in the whole realm o
Science.

From Carlton & Porter, publishers of (Methodist) books, Mulberr
York, we have received the following:

THE LIFE OF THE REV. ADAM CLARKE, LL. D., &c. By J. W. ETHERI
Doctor of Philosophy, of the University of Heidelberg. 1859. 12mo

THE CHRISTIAN LAWYER, being a portraiture of the Life and Ch
William George Baker. 1859. 12mo. pp. 320.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF DAN YOUNG, a New England Preacher of the O
Edited by W. P. Strickland. 1860. 12mo. pp. 380.

SKETCHES OF NEW ENGLAND DIVINES. By Rev. D. SHERMAN. 186
pp. 443.

These are brief but well written sketches of the following divi
Cotton, Richard Mather, Roger Williams, Increase Mather, Cotto
Eleazer Mather, John Warham, Jesse Lee, Jonathan Edwards, Elijah

Timothy Dwight, Wilbur Fisk, Ezra Stiles, Lemuel Haynes, Billy Hibbard, Timothy Merritt, Jonathan D. Bridge, Nathaniel Emmons, Joshua Crowell, George Pickering, Stephen Olin.

HIDDEN TREASURE; or the Secret of Success in Life. By Miss SARAH A. BABCOCK. Four Illustrations. 1860. 12mo. pp. 264.

The Messrs. Harpers are issuing a new edition of the Latin and Greek Classics. They are neat little volumes; the type is clear and distinct, and no pains are spared to secure perfect accuracy in the text. The works of Horace and Æschylus have just been published.

THE BIBLICAL REASON WHY; a Family Guide to Scripture Readings, and a Handbook for Biblical Students. By the Author of "The Reason Why—General Services," "The Reason Why—Natural History," "The Housewife's Reason Why," "The Historical Reason Why," &c., &c. New York: Dick & Fitzgerald. 1860. 12mo. pp. 324.

The English edition, of which the one before us is a reprint, states that the Introduction was written by a "Clergyman of the Church of England." Whether the American publishers, in omitting this, have omitted other things which they thought might hinder its sale among Sectarians, we do not know; our objection to the work, however, lies in the spirit that pervades the entire work; in the fact that it attempts to give the "Reason Why" God has revealed this, that, and the other portion of His Word. A "thus saith the Lord," is the "reason why" we are to believe, whether we can or cannot fathom the depths of God's Wisdom in making a Revelation. The author of the work seems to be a very superficial theologian, and an unsafe guide.

GOSPEL THOUGHTS; or Christ in the Prayer Book, a Series of Short Meditations on the Epistles and Gospels, as selected in the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. W. TREVOR NICHOLSON, B. A. London: Pertheim, Macintosh & Hunt. 1859. 12mo. pp. 383.

These meditations by an English Clergyman are not marked by any one striking characteristic; they are devout, practical, and moderate.

LIFE AND TIMES OF GEN. SAM. DALE, the Mississippi Partisan. By J. F. H. CLAIBORNE. Illustrated by John McLenan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 238.

The life and times of the famous Gen. Sam. Dale, illustrate one portion of our national history which in itself has all the charm of romance, and to which posterity will look back with the keenest interest. He was born in Virginia in 1771, but kept moving westward with the advancing tide of emigration; was constantly familiar with the dangers of frontier life; was brought face to face in war and in council with the most noted Indian Chiefs, as Tecumseh, Pushamatalia, &c., was active and prominent in the early organization of the territories and States of Alabama and Mississippi; and after holding many offces of trust and honor, died at Daleville, Lauderdale Co., Mississippi, May 24th, 1841. He

was a real specimen of a genuine frontier man; unlearned, yet modest, truthful, brave; remorseless in battle, yet forgiving; he seems to have been a great pet of Gen. Jackson, whom he nearly idolized. His account of his visit to Washington when Jackson was President, is not the least interesting portion of the volume, which is, throughout, very entertaining.

LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF DAVID. By JOHN N. NORTON, Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky., Author of "Lives of the Bishops," &c.

These Lectures are distinguished, like all the writings of Mr. Norton, by a vein of strong common sense, and a simple straight-forward style; and there is in them a power and faithfulness of intro-spection, which shows that the Christian life is with the author a deep reality.

THE STILL HOUR; or Communion with God. By AUSTIN PHELPS, Prof. in Andover Theol. Seminary. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 186.

LIFE OF LAFAYETTE, written for Children. By E. CECIL. With Six Illustrations. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 218.

A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. By MARY HOWITT. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. pp. 406, 387.

Miss Howitt in her social theories is intensely radical; and her present work was evidently designed specially for the middle classes of England. She has been a close reader of Bancroft and Hildreth, and in her History has made fewer gross blunders than almost any English writer that has written upon this country.

LIFE IN SPAIN; past and present. By WALTER THORNBURY. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 388.

Mr. Thornbury's photographic sketches of "Life in Spain," are spirited, lifelike, and amusing.

LUCY CROFTON, By the Author of "Margaret Maitland," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 222.

THE AMERICAN ALMANAC AND REPOSITORY OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE FOR THE YEAR 1860. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 392.

This standard work, now in its *thirty-first* volume, is too well known to need description. No pains have been spared in collecting full and authentic information as to the government, finances, legislation, public institutions, internal improvements, and resources, &c., &c., of the United States and of the several States.

THE WEEKLY EUCHARIST; The Old Path and Good Way of the Church. By the Rev. EUGENE AUGS. HOFFMAN, M. A., Rector of Christ Church, Elizabeth, N. J. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1859. 12mo. pp. 50.

We have nothing to add to the opinion of this little volume which we expressed on the appearance of the first edition. If the objections to a "Weekly

sion," are valid, it ought not to be administered more than once or twice r; or, to make it still more impressive, once or twice in a life-time. The stion is not to the frequency, but to the nature of the Holy Sacrament; change since the Reformation on this point among the Protestants, in o both the Sacraments, is radical and wide-sweeping.

FOR CHILDREN, Compiled and Set to Appropriate Music. By the Rev. J. AN YOUNG, an Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York. Juve- eries. Part I. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1860. 4to. pp. 48.

work is a movement in the right direction. This First Part contains x hymns, each set to its own music. The Author, or compiler rather, ed to *avoid originality* both in the poetry and music; yet both have ne careful revision by competent advisers. The Hymns are very beauti- several of the Melodies are really exquisite. This First Part contains relating to Morning and Evening, Home and its Relations, and the Reve- f God through Nature. The Second will contain those relating to Holy , the Duties arising out of the Christian Covenant, and the Church Year. rd will be devoted to Miscellaneous Hymns and Songs.

ne of the brightest signs of the times to see in the Church, taste, refine- legant culture, becoming Christianized, and devoting itself to Christian n in the true sense of that word. It will not be so difficult henceforth sight of, and retain our hold upon, the young when they come to a cer-

OF PETER THE GREAT, Emperor of Russia. By JACOB ABBOTT. With vings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 368.

s another volume in the series of "Histories for Children," in preparing Mr. Abbott has been very successful. The same writer has also prepared wing volumes, which are by the same publishers.

OF RAINBOW AND LUCKY. Two Vols. 12mo. pp. 201, 187.

SUMMER IN ASHCROFT. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & ers. 12mo. pp. 204.

rd of country life for children.

RE ON THE WORD "CATHOLIC" IN THE CREED. By the Rev. CHARLES R. LL, Rector of Calvary Church, Philadelphia, Feb. 14, 1860.

ecture is a well considered vindication of the use of the word Catholic reeds and Offices of the Church; it is a clear setting forth of the great mbodied in that word, and a convincing statement of its perverted use tomanists. There is no word in our language so misinterpreted in the literature and current language of the day, and to such mischievous this same word Catholic. We beg our readers, one and all, never to e word to be so used in their presence without correction, unless the ances of time and place positively forbid it. Words are things; and let en everywhere unite to rescue a great truth and a great principle.

We also take this opportunity for another suggestion. In the July No. of the "P. E. Quarterly Review," there was an Article in review of the German translation of the Prayer Book, faulting the Committee for using the word *Katholisch* in the Creeds, on the ground that the Germans always understand that word as synonymous with Romish. Now we beg to state, that the Committee, as we happen to know, used the word *Katholisch* in this case advisedly and deliberately, with a full understanding of the historical and philological argument. Because such a man as Bunsen has misled the German mind as to the word Catholic, and not only this, but as to the thing itself too, is this is a reason why we should give up the word to the Romanists? Nothing of course would please them better. Instead of Germanizing the Creed, far better to Catholicise the German mind; the very thing that that mind in our country most needs. Faithful explanation would make this matter easily understood in any of our German congregations.

THE DOCTRINES OF ORIGINAL SIN AND THE TRINITY; discussed in a Correspondence between a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church in England, and a Layman of Boston, U. S. Boston. 1859. 8vo. pp. 50.

This singular "Correspondence," begun by the Layman, (a Boston Unitarian) and published by the Layman, has also a Preface by the Layman, in which he claims that it "presents a fair view of the different prevailing opinions on the vexed questions of Original Sin and the Trinity, with the advantages of placing the arguments along side each other." On the contrary, we are reminded by it of an aged, celebrated, shrewd and learned Theological Professor, who used to preside, sometimes, at the theological discussions of the students, in which the profoundest mysteries of Nature and of Revelation were made the subject of their pert, and flippant, and dogmatic opinions. Annoyed beyond endurance, sometimes, at their trifling, the venerable man was accustomed to break out with the interrogation: "Young gentlemen, are you quite sure that you know what you are talking about?" The English Clergyman in this Correspondence is a man of reading, and there is now and then in his Letters a stroke of quiet reproof, whose scorching severity is quite unappreciated by the Boston Layman. He evidently started in the correspondence, little understanding the tone and temper of Modern Unitarianism.

SPIRITUALISM TESTED: Or the Facts of its History classified and their cause in Nature verified from Ancient and Modern Testimonies. By GEORGE W. SAMPSON, D.D. Boston. 1860. 12mo. pp. 185.

We are not disposed to say any thing upon this dirty subject, and are sorry to allude to it. A single paper before us give an account of several instances of the grossest and most abominable licentiousness, cloaked under this disguise of the devil. Here is one: "The Utica *Herald*, of March 13th, records the recent operations of a quartette of "free lovers," in that city, as follows: It seems that Mr. F. Skinner, who has been a somewhat prominent spiritualist, and who is a married man, was seized with a sudden attraction for a young and blooming damsel named Kate Beardsley, whom he brought home with him. Straightway, Mrs. Skinner was taken with an affinity for a certain Dr. Bentley, a clairvoyant physician, who has recently lectured at Morgan Hall, on the subject of "Conjugal

Relations." Dr. Bentley has a wife and three children, but he illustrated his faith in the doctrines advanced in his lectures, by taking Mrs. Skinner according to the laws of mutual affinity. Rumor has it that this double pair, mated but not married, are now living in the same house, by mutual consent."

As another instance, a white, blooming, wealthy young widow in Connecticut, and hitherto highly respectable, not long since married a strapping negro as black as jet. She gave as a reason, "that she had received communications from her deceased husband in the spirit world, advising her to marry Francis, and stating that since he left this vale of tears he had been conjugally united to the spirit of a colored damsel."

We hope never again to soil our pages with this disgusting subject.

ELEVENTH TRIENNIAL REPORT of the G. P. E. S. S. U. and Church Book Society. 1859. New York.

An abstract of this Report will be found under the head of Domestic Intelligence.

FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania. Phila. 1860.

This noble Society, in retiring from the Missionary field where it has done a glorious work, will now direct its energies to another department of labor.

CATALOGUE of the General Theological Seminary for 1859–60.

Number of students in the Senior Class 17; Middle Class 18; Junior Class 21. Total, 56.

REGISTER OF HOBART FREE COLLEGE, Geneva, N. Y., for the Academical year 1859–60.

The whole number of students is 127. Of these, there are Seniors 24; Juniors 25; Sophomores 33; Freshmen 28; Medical Students 22.

CATALOGUE of the Nashotah Theological Seminary for 1859–60.

There are now twenty-eight Candidates for Orders pursuing their studies at this Seminary.

REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE FOR 1859–60.

By a recent arrangement, the Students in the preparatory department at the Nashotah Seminary have been transferred to Racine College, making the whole number of the Students at the College, 40.

CATALOGUE of the State University of Michigan, 1860.

In this flourishing Institution there is a large and able corps of Professors; and there are on its list the names of 519 students.

MISSIONARY PAPER. Nos. 4 and 5, by the Associate Mission for Minnesota, 1860.

THE RT. REV. BISHOP OTEY'S Pastoral Letter. Memphis, Tenn. 1860. 8vo. pp 16.

Like every thing from Bishop Otey, this Letter is large-hearted, sensible, and fully up to the times.

THE REV. DR. BOLLES' Salutatory Sermon in the Church of the Advent, Bost 1859. 8vo. pp. 26.

We cannot doubt that noble and true hearted laymen in Boston will ral around a standard-bearer who has already given such ample proof of his fitne for the work which he has now undertaken.

THE REV. C. F. KNIGHT'S Opening Sermon in St. Mark's Church, Boston, on th 3d Sunday in Advent, 1859.

A sensible sermon and in an excellent spirit.

THE REV. DR. CREIGHTON'S and the REV. J. S. SPENCER'S Sermons in Christ Church, Tarrytown, N. Y., Dec. 4, and Dec. 11, 1859, on the death of WASHINGTON IRVING.

The affectionate tribute paid to the memory of Washington Irving by Dr. Creighton, and the somewhat critical analysis of his character by Mr. Spencer, both bear witness to his sincere, humble piety.

THE REV. R. M. ABERCROMBIE'S Sermon on the death of Samuel Green, Esq., in Christ Church, Hartford, Conn., Sept. 11, 1859.

THE REV. G. P. SCHETKY'S Valedictory Sermon in Grace Church, Memphis, Tenn., Oct. 2, 1859.

THE REV. C. C. BARCLAY'S Centennial Sermon in St. John's Church, North Haven, Conn., April 24th, 1859.

THE REV. LEWIS BARTON'S Anniversary Sermon in St. John's Church, Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 4, 1859.

THE REV. DR. E. M. VANDEUSEN'S Seventh Anniversary Sermon in St. Peter' Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

There is one feature of the Gospel which this money-making age seems full to appreciate; that it is "without money and without price." But whether th Gospel will *save such men* at last, is quite another question.

THE REV. DR. W. H. LEWIS'S Farewell Sermon in the Church of the Holy Tri ity, Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 26, 1860.

Dr. Lewis leaves this Parish with a list of 546 communicants, a Sunday Scho of 412 members, and a debt of $65,000. The first cost of the church was near $200,000.

THE REV. C. R. DUFFIE'S Sermon in the Church of St. John Baptist, New Yor Jan. 15, 1860. "The Salvability of the Heathen, no excuse for neglect of re vealed duty by the Christian."

The leading sentiment of this Sermon is very clearly stated and ably argue

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

CONSECRATION.

The Rev. JOSEPH C. TALBOT, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Indianapolis, Ind., was consecrated Missionary Bishop for the North West, Feb. 15th, in the Church of which he had been Rector. The following Bishops were present, and officiated in the Services. Rt. Rev. B. B. SMITH, D.D., of Kentucky; Rt. Rev. JACKSON KEMPER, D. D., LL. D., of Wisconsin; Rt. Rev. C. S. HAWKS, D. D., of Missouri; Rt. Rev. GEORGE UPFOLD, D. D., LL. D., of Indiana; Rt. Rev. G. T. BEDELL, D. D., of Ohio. Bishop KEMPER presided. The Rev. W. G. SPENCER, of Terre Haute, Ind., said Morning Prayer, assisted by the Rev. Messrs. J. B. WAKEFIELD, and A. GREGORY. The Litany was said by Bishop UPFOLD. Bishop SMITH preached from 2 Cor. v. 20th. The Bishop-elect was conducted to the chancel by Presbyters Rev. Messrs. TEN BROECK and RUNCIE, and having been vested with his rochet, was presented to the presiding Bishop, the Rt. Rev. JACKSON KEMPER, by the Rt. Rev. Bishops UPFOLD and BEDELL. His testimonials were read by the Rev. Dr. CLARKSON of Chicago. All the Bishops present united in the laying on of hands. The Communion was administered by the Rt. Rev. Bishop KEMPER, assisted by Bishops SMITH, HAWKS, BEDELL, and TALBOT.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Abbott, Benj. H.	Potter, H.	Mar. 6, 1860,	Trinity, New Rochelle, N.Y.
Adams, William F.	Green,	Dec. 27, 1859,	St. Andrew's, Jackson, Miss.
Anketell, John H.	Williams,	Dec. 29, 1859,	Trinity, New Haven, Conn.
Babcock, Charles.	Potter, H.	Mar. 4, 1860,	Holy Innocents, An'ndale, N.Y
Bartley, William M.	Cobbs,	Dec. 18, 1859,	Trinity, Columbus, Ga.
Brown, R. H.	Potter, A.	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Matthias, Phil.
Clinton, ——	Whipple,	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Paul's, St. Paul, Minn.
Everhart, George W.	Cobbs,	Mar. 16, 1860,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
Falt, Alexander.	Whittingham,	Dec 18, 1859,	St. James' Coll., Md.
Gholson, John Y. Y.	Cobbs,	Feb. 19, 1860,	St. Paul's, Selma, Ala.
Hale, Charles R.	Potter, A.	Jan. 8, 1860,	St. Paul's, Phila., Penn.
Hansborough, J. S.	Johns,	Dec. 18, 1859,	Theol. Sem., Va.
Helm, J. J.	Bowman,	Mar. 18, 1860,	St. James', Phila., Penn.
Mills, L. I.	Whittingham,	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. James' Coll., Md.
Morgan, Jas. Henry,	Potter, H.	Mar. 6, 1860,	Trinity, New Rochelle, N. Y.
Philips, Solomon,	Whittingham,	Mar. 4, 1860,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Smith, George W.	Whittingham,	Mar. 4, 1860,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
Smith, L. Ward,	DeLancey,	Mar. 4, 1860,	Christ, Rochester, N. Y.
Tatlock, William,	Potter, H.	Dec. 21, 1859,	Theo. Sem. Chap., N. Y. City.
Tustin, Josiah P.	Clark,	Nov. 27, 1859,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
Wells, Edward Livingston,	Williams,	Dec. 29, 1859,	Trinity, New Haven, Conn.
Williams, Chas. S.	Potter, H.	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Luke's, New York City.
Williams, G.	Johns,	Dec. 18, 1859,	Theol Sem., Va.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Canfield, Chas. H.	Potter, H.	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Luke's, New York City.
" Chase, Robert G.	Bowman,	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Matthias, Phila., Penn.
" Cheney, Chas. E.	DeLancey,	Mar. 4, 1860,	Christ, Rochester, N. Y.
" Cobbs, R. H.	Cobbs,	Jan. 30, 1860,	Nativity, Huntsville, Ala.
" Coolidge, J. I. T.	Clark,	Mar. 14, 1860,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
" Conrad, Thos. K.	Potter, A.	Jan. 19, 1860,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Gesner, A. Herbert,	Potter, H.	Mar. 6, 1860,	Trinity, New Rochelle, N. Y.
" Latimer, Geo. A.	Potter, A.	Jan. 8, 1860,	St. Paul's, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Leverett, W. C.	Clark,	Mar. 8, 1860,	Emanuel, Newport, R. I.
" Magill, Matthew,	Smith,	Mar. 2, 1860,	Trinity, Covington, Ky.
" Margott, David,	Potter, H.	Mar. 6, 1860,	Trinity, New Rochelle, N. Y.
" Newlin, Joseph D.	Potter, A.	Jan. 19, 1860,	St. Mark's, Phila., Pa.
" Quinby, J. Hamilton,	Gregg,	Jan. 22, 1860,	St. David's, Cheraw, S. C.
" Saunders, Jos. S.	Odenheimer,	Dec. 18, 1859,	Grace, Newark, N. J.
" Scramm, Charles,	Potter, H.	Mar. 6, 1860,	Trinity, New Rochelle, N. Y.
" Smith, Marshall B.	Lee, A.	Dec. 7, 1859,	St. Andrew's, Wilmingt'n, Del
" Spalding, Henry W.	Kemper,	Jan. 8, 1860,	St. James', Milwaukie, Wis.
" Stockton, W. R.	Bowman,	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Matthias, Phila., Pa.
" Widdemer, Eph. D.	Potter, H.	Dec. 18, 1859,	St. Luke's, New York City.
" Wingate, ——	Clark,	Mar. 8, 1860,	Emanuel, Newport, R. I.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Grace,	DeLancey,	Feb. 9, 1860,	Buffalo, N. Y.
Holy Innocents,	Potter, H.	Feb. 2, 1860,	Annandale, N. Y.
Holy Martys,	Potter, H.	Jan. 16, 1860,	New York City, N. Y.
Nativity,	Cobbs,	Jan. 29, 1860,	Huntsville, Ala.
Redeemer,	Clark,	Dec. 23, 1859.	Providence, R. I.
St. James',	Williams,	Dec. 20, 1859,	Glastenbury, Conn.
St. John's,	Green,	Nov. 17, 1859,	Aberdeen, Miss.
St. John's,	Davis,	Nov. 27, 1859,	Richland, S. C.
St. John's,	Kip,	Feb. 5, 1860,	Petaluma, Cal.
St. Mark's,	Williams,	Mar. 14, 1860,	Bridgewater, Conn.
Trinity,	Odenheimer,	Mar. 15, 1860,	Mount Holly, N. J.
St. Paul's,	Chase,	Dec. 13, 1859,	Concord, N. H.
St. Paul's,	Kip,	Jan. 12, 1860,	Benicia, Cal.
Trinity,	Smith,	Mar. 1, 1860,	Covington, Ky.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

uesday, Nov. 1, 1859, the Rev. NATHAN STEM, D. D., Rector of St. arch, Norristown, Penn, aged 54 years and 5 months. Dr. Stem was Chester Co., Pa. His parents were pious and worthy members of the e was admitted into the Church by the Sacrament of Baptism in in- was early trained to wait upon her public ministrations. At the age , under the Ministry of the late Rev. Levi Bull, D. D., he was con- Bishop White, and was admitted to the Holy Communion. Not long he entered upon mercantile pursuits, in the city of Philadelphia, me under the notice and pastoral care of the late Rev. Dr. George or of St. John's Church, and through his instrumentality, Mr. Stem's as directed to the Christian Ministry. In the year 1824, he entered Theo. Seminary in Alexandria; but from ill health he left that in- nd entered Kenyon College. He next removed to Worthington, Ohio, idence of the Rt. Rev. Philander Chase, and pursued his theological er the supervision of that most excellent prelate. By Bishop Chase, nitted to the Diaconate in 1828, and to the Priesthood in 1829. Mr. parochial charge was in Delaware, Ohio, where he labored several ptably and usefully. He then accepted an invitation to St. Stephen's rrisburg, Penn., where he established a reputation for consistency, purpose, and fidelity in the discharge of his duties. In the year s called to his late charge—the parish which he served to the time h—a period of twenty-one years.

g and intimate acquaintance with Dr. Stem, we know that there was is private and public character worthy of grateful commemoration. a Christian, a preacher, a pastor, he exhibited rare traits.

rchman, he was in no sense an ultraist; party spirit in the Church of schewed; yet, in his views, he was decided, firm, and uncompromi- ved the Church's ways, and the Church's principles, and was ready to publicly and privately, and to defend them whenever and by whom- iled.

, for many years, enjoyed the friendship of Bishop Bowman; and s determined by the neighboring clergy in Montgomery County, to gentleman's name before the Convention of Penn., as a candidate for nt Bishoprick, that duty was, by common assent, assigned to him.

, as the oldest resident Presbyter, was, at the time of his death, the f the Schuylkill Convocation—an office which he had occupied from f its organization.

ree of D. D. was conferred upon him by Franklin and Marshall Col- ncaster County, Penn., only three months before his death; an honor red.

's health had been failing for more than a year before his death. was an organic affection of the heart. As the Saviour in the Church eat theme of his preaching and teaching, so, at the last, a calm and eliance upon the merits of Him, Whose blood cleanseth from all led his soul—and laying his head upon the bosom of his Saviour, "he is life out sweetly there."

Dr. Stem had requested, that the funeral services should be performed by his constant friend, Bishop Bowman; and, in the event of the Bishop's absence, by his nearest brother Clergymen and early friends, the Rev. George Mintzer, and the Rev. Wm. H. Rees. The sad duty devolved upon these Clergymen, being accompanied to the Church and the grave by more than twenty sorrowing brethren in the Ministry. Dr. Stem had requested the Rev. Mr. Rees to administer the Lord's Supper to his bereaved Congregation, on the next Sunday but one after his decease, and that opportunity was taken for preaching his funeral sermon. It was a singular coincidence, that Dr. Stem was the next of the Clergy in Pennsylvania to follow to his rest his much respected and beloved spiritual father, Dr. Bull; and the day upon which the Rev. Dr. May, of Alexandria, preached the funeral sermon of Dr. Bull, was the day upon which Mr. Rees preached that of the Rev. Dr. Stem. This brief Memorial is due, we think, to one who will long live in the hearts of those who knew him best.

Died in Cheshire, Conn., Jan. 1st, 1860, the Rev. Peter G. Clarke, aged 68 years. He was born in Woodbury, Ct., Feb. 11, 1793. Having received his classical and theological training under that able scholar and divine, Dr. Tillotson Brownson, he was made honorary Master of Arts by Yale College in 1821. He was ordained Deacon in Trinity Church, New York, Oct. 20th, 1818, by the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, (this diocese being then vacant,) and began his ministry in the city of Norwich, as assistant to the Rev. John Tyler, and Missionary to several places in the neighborhood. On the 13th of January, 1820, he was admitted to the Priesthood by the present presiding Bishop, who then, for the first time, conferred Holy Orders. Mr. Clarke labored very acceptably at different points in the diocese of Connecticut, until Oct. 1838, when he was commissioned Chaplain in the U. S. Navy. Since that time he has been occupied with the duties assigned him by the Navy Department. Of late, though seeming to others in the enjoyment of his usual health, he felt himself affected by a hidden disease, and while careful not to alarm his family, and with entire reliance upon the merits of Christ, and the most filial trust in the unfailing wisdom and goodness of our Father in Heaven, he calmly set his house in order, against his change should come. In May, 1859, on reporting for duty, under orders for a cruise to China and Japan, he was found physically unequal to the labors of the station, and accordingly returned home, to await in humble resignation, the unfolding of His will, "who doeth all things well." During the interval, his bodily powers have been failing, while his spirit seems to have steadily increased in purity and brightness.

And on the morning of New Year's Day, just as the first rays of the sun entered his chamber, he fell asleep in Jesus, and his freed soul began to enjoy, as we reverently trust, an endless year of happiness in the Paradise of God. His funeral was attended from St. Peter's Church, Cheshire, by the Rev. Mr. Bryant, Rector of the parish, assisted by the Rev. J. H. Babcock and the Rev. J. M. Willey; and the Rev. Dr. Clarke, and the Rev. Messrs. Holcomb, Townsend, and Wells, acting as pall-bearers.

Died in Sacramento, Cal., Jan. 14, 1860, the Rev. Frederick W. Hatch, D.D. aged 71 years. Mr. Hatch was ordained Deacon in Baltimore, Md., in 1810, by

Bishop Claggett, and Priest by the same Bishop in 1818, in Annapolis. He had charge successively of the parishes in Edenton, N. C., and Frederick, Md., when he removed to Virginia and took charge of Fredericksville Parish, where he remained from 1820 to 1830. Here his labors were eminently laborious and successful in reviving the Church dormant and almost dead. Mr. Jefferson was his friend and parishioner, and headed the subscription for building a new Church. In 1832 he removed to Washington, D. C., and officiated in Christ Church until 1836; and was Chaplain to the United States Senate. In 1836 he removed to Poughkeepsie, N. Y., where under his ministrations a new Church was erected. In 1843 he removed to Wisconsin, and took charge of the Parishes in Southport and Racine, and in Racine a new Church was built. In 1850 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and had temporary charge of Christ and St. George's Churches. In June 1856 he went to California, and labored as a Missionary with great zeal and self-devotion in Marysville and other places. The Rev. Mr. Hill, who preached his Funeral Discourse, in Grace Church, Sacramento, Jan. 16th, and from which most of the above facts are gleaned, says of him: "Unselfish have been his labors as a Clergyman and teacher in this State. He was a missionary without money and without price. And being one of the ripest of American scholars, it was his delight to teach the youth the classics he so loved. When, some three years since, a brother clergyman thought of establishing a Female Seminary of high character in this city, our friend not only bade him God speed, but, in my presence, offered to take the place of teacher of the French, Spanish and Latin languages, without compensation." * * * * * * * * "His mind was not clear enough during the last week for the celebration of the Holy Communion, but I did succeed once and again in recalling it to the present, and holding it, while we spake together of the unfailing love of Jesus Christ. That was the key note, even of his wanderings. He was preaching to old friends and praying for them and himself. And as clearly as ever did he know what I said when, on Wednesday last, I read the Litany for the dying, during which he often ejaculated an earnest, Amen. Almost the last word he spoke that could be understood, was to tell me of the 'peace of God.' He died in peace, a ransomed sinner, and has gone to his reward."

Died at Hanover, N. H., Jan. 19, of consumption, at the residence of his brother, Prof. Putnam, the Rev. Charles S. Putnam, late Rector of the Church of the Redeemer, Brooklyn, N. Y., aged 42.

The early history of Mr. Putnam we are unable to give at present. He was an alumnus of the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va., and previously to taking charge of his Parish in Brooklyn, was Rector of Parishes in Woodbury, Derby, and Wallingford, Conn. He was a man of more than ordinary ability; retiring in his habits, a scholar in his tastes, a clear and forcible writer, strictly conscientious, and thoroughly loyal to the Church. Warm friends and admirers in each of his several parishes will mourn his early death.

Died in Charleston, S. C., Feb. 3, 1860, the Rev. Cranmore Wallace, aged 58 years. Mr. Wallace was born at Ackworth, N. H., Feb. 27, 1802. His parentage was from the descendants of the Scotch-Irish stock, who settled that region, and were Congregationalists in their religion. Mr. Wallace was educated at Dartmouth, (N. H.) College, where he was graduated in 1824. After the com-

pletion of his Collegiate education, Mr. Wallace engaged, for a short teaching in Boston and in other towns in Mass., but removed to South as early as 1830. For the first ten years of his residence in that Stat the Principal of the Cheraw Academy, where he commenced the study ogy with a view to taking Orders in the Church. For the purpose of his theological studies to better advantage, Mr. Wallace went to Cl and became Principal of the South Carolina Male School. He was Deacon, by Rt. Rev. Bishop Bowen, in 1836, and was admitted to Holy the year following by the same prelate. His early clerical labors were a missionary in the upper districts of the State, until he accepted of th ship of St. David's Church, Cheraw. He was subsequently in charg Parishes of St. James, James Island, St. John's, Berkeley, and in 1848 h the incumbent of St. Stephen's Chapel in Charleston, where he has e resided. He was also Rector of the Church Home, an excellent charit ciation, and has been for many years Secretary of the Diocesan Conven was also a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese.

A full portrait of his life and character we cannot here give. He w of rare worth, a ripe scholar, of large and extensive reading, and po mind of high capacity and consummate discipline. His Christian chara however, his brightest personality. He was an apostolic minister, who c himself sent to the sick, the suffering, the poor, and the dying of this wor friend he was. So great was Mr. Wallace's reputation in this depa Christian duty, that his friend, Bishop Gregg of Texas, had success suaded him to accompany him to the missionary field of that large Dio sudden death has prevented the consummation of their hopes in that d

As a Churchman, his own experience and observation, as well as his reading, led him to take positive views of Christ's Institutions, and he h views firmly and conscientiously. Mr. Wallace's last illness extended three weeks, and was accompanied with much suffering. But the pai disturb his serene peace, or impair the liveliness of his faith. God, had served night and day, with heart, and head, and hand, made him suffer, and he endured—sustained and soothed by the abiding presenc Who is mighty to help.

PASTORAL LETTER OF NINE ROMISH AMERICAN BISH

The present troubles of Pope Pius IX. especially the uprising of people against the stupendous impositions of a tyrannical, lazy, vicious cipled priesthood, and the strong probability of a vigorous reform in It the auspices of Napoleon III.—all these have called forth a very remark ument from *nine* Romish Bishops in this country, on the Temporal Pow Pope. It is dated at New York, Jan. 19, 1860, and is signed by the fol

† JOHN HUGHES, Archbishop of New York, State of New York.
† JOHN McCLOSKEY, Bishop of Albany, State of New York.
† JOHN BERNARD FITZPATRICK, Bishop of Boston, State of M
† JOHN TIMON, Bishop of Buffalo, State of New York.
† JOHN LOUGHLIN, Bishop of Brooklyn, State of New York.
† JAMES ROOSEVELT BAYLEY, Bishop of Newark, State of New

†LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND, Bishop of Burlington, State of Vermont.
†DAVID WILLIAM BACON, (Per Procuratoreur,) Bishop of Portland, Me.
†FRANCIS PATRICK McFARLAND, Bishop of Hartford, State of Conn.

These Bishops do not take the ground which some Romish writers assume, that the Pope is, by divine right, supreme ruler in all things, temporal and spiritual; and furthermore, they are very careful to dodge the question as to the genuineness of those old forgeries, by which, from the Ninth to the revival of learning in the Fifteenth century, the pretended donation of Constantine to the See of Rome, "of the city of Rome, with Italy, *and all the provinces of the empire of the West,*" was generally regarded as authentic. Archbishop Hughes is too shrewd a man to endorse openly those outrageous falsehoods and forgeries. Still, these nine Bishops have taken their stand in defence of the temporal sovereignty of the Bishop of Rome, and this is the one point to be remembered. Get his power, when, or how the Pope might, the thing itself is what these men contend for. They say, "when the question presented to us touches the rights of our Holy Father as a temporal sovereign—when it is proposed to meddle with the temporalities of the States of the Church, then we feel as if a wound was about to be inflicted on the apple of our eye."

This "Pastoral Letter" is a curious document; and although it was evidently designed to operate in the secret council chambers of the old world, it is worth reading at home. These Romish Bishops never meddle with politics! Oh, no, not they! See then the implied threats to the English and French Governments, the only great Powers which the Pope fears in this matter, in the following paragraphs, if they interfere to break the chains of priestly despotism and misrule, in that wretched country!

"We and our people have watched the astonishing success with which the present Emperor of the French has governed the mighty nation, at the head of which Providence has placed him. He has had, and still has, our best wishes; but if he should touch the States of the Church, his act will be the bad end of a good beginning. He need not go outside of his family archives for lessons on this subject. His great uncle, in his matchless human wisdom, once arranged the affairs of Italy. There was even a King of Rome, but he never reigned."

"Coming from the British cabinet, this is a novel, and, beyond all question, a dangerous doctrine. It points out a key in the organism of governments, which, if touched with the slightest pressure of the Pope's little finger, would convulse provinces, kingdoms and empires."

In this connection, we ought not to forget, that in the able *Roman Catholic Review*, (Quarterly,) edited by O. A. Brownson, we find such teaching as the following:

"The Church (in person of the Pope) bears, by divine right, both swords, (temporal and spiritual.) The temporal sovereign holds it (the temporal sword) subject to her order, to be exercised under her direction."

"We believe the direct temporal authority of the Pope as the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth."

"Indeed, we can better endure open, avowed Protestantism itself, than stingy, narrow-minded, frozen-hearted Gallicanism, always trying to split the difference between Peter and Cæsar, God and the Devil."

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

THE NEW BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE.

The Rev. Edward Hyndman Beckles, D. D., has been nominated by the Cro to the bishopric of Sierra Leone, in the room of the Right Rev. Dr. Bowen, d ceased. He was for some years curate of St Michael's Church, Trinidad, in t diocese of Barbadoes; and in 1853 was presented to the rectory of St. Pete St. Christopher's, in the Diocese of Antigua, which he held until his recent vi to England. The Bishop will take out with him a small staff of clergy.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

The Hon. and Right Rev. George Murray, Lord Bishop of Rochester, died the 16th of February. He was, in point of tenure of the Episcopal dignity, t eldest of the English Bishops. The venerable prelate was born in 1784, t second son of Lord George Murray, Bishop of St. David's, who himself was t second son of the third Duke of Atholl. He was educated at Christ Chur Oxford, where he graduated B. A. in 1806, M. A. in 1810, and D. D. in 1814. the latter year, and at the early age of thirty, he was consecrated Bishop Sodor and Man. After a fruitful activity of thirteen years, his Lordship was, 1827, translated to the diocese of Rochester, which had become vacant by t decease of the Right Rev. Walter King. Rochester was then but a sm bishopric, comprising only ninety-six benefices, and with an average gross yea income of 1523*l.* It was during the tenure of the now deceased prelate th the see was increased to its present extent over the counties of Essex a Herts, and the number of benefices augmented to 564, while the gross inco was raised to 5000*l.* The Bishop of Rochester was essentially a sound Chur man of the old school, and kept always aloof from extreme parties; he lov the "old ways," and honestly and faithfully "walked in them." His Lordsh experienced during the last years of his life many very severe domestic affl tions, sufficient to have broken down a younger and a stronger man than he. I had, morever, had several attacks of illness, under the last of which he su cumbed, at the age of 76. His Lordship leaves by his wife, Lady Sarah H Drummond, daughter of Robert, ninth Earl of Kinnoul, whom he married 1811, a large family of children.

NEW BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

The Rev. Charles John Vaughan has been nominated Bishop of Rochester, place of the late Hon. and Right Rev. George Murray. He was educated at Tri ity College, Cambridge, where his career was a very brilliant one. He was Crav University Scholar and Porson Prizeman in 1836 and 1837, Brown's Medalist f Greek Ode and Epigrams in 1837, graduated B. A. 1838, Fellow of Trinity C lege 1839, M. A. 1841, and D. D. 1845. He was ordained Deacon and Priest 1841, and in 1844 was named Head Master of Harrow School, which post he r signed in 1859; in the latter year he was also nominated Chaplain in Ordina to the Queen. Dr. Vaughan will be the 96th Bishop of Rochester. The see

Rochester is, next to that of Canterbury, the most ancient in England, being founded A. D. 604, by the celebrated Father of the Church, St. Augustine. Formerly the Archbishop of Canterbury nominated the person to be elected Bishop of Rochester, and received from that Bishop the same homage which other Bishops pay to the Sovereign. The bishopric was valued (26th Henry VIII.) at 444*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* per annum in the whole, and at 411*l.* 0*s.* 11*d.* clear. The ancient diocese, however, comprised but a small part of the county of Kent, with Isleham parish, in Cambridgeshire, and Freckenham, in Suffolk. It was distributed into the deaneries of Rochester, Dartford, Shoreham, Malling and Fordham, under the archdeaconry of Rochester. The number of benefices in the diocese, returned to the Commissioners in 1831, inclusive of sinecure rectories, but exclusive of benefices annexed to other preferments, was 94, besides two not returned. The average gross income of incumbents in the 94 returned benefices was 474*l.* The total number of curates was 60, and the average stipends, included in the incomes of the incumbents 109*l.* Seven years later, in 1838, the total number of benefices, without exclusion, is stated in the Parliamentary returns to have been 98, the incumbents in 38 of which were non-resident. At present the episcopal jurisdiction includes, besides the city and deanery of Rochester, the whole of Essex except nine parishes, and Hertfordshire, with a total population of 577,298 souls, and a territory extending over 1,585,450 acres. There are 86 deaneries, 564 benefices, 240 curates, and 208,643 church sittings within the diocese, the gross income of which is now valued at 5000*l.*

CONVOCATION: PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

On Wed., Jan. 25th, Convocation assembled, concurrently with the meeting of Parliament; but it was generally understood that an adjournment would be had to a later day for business, and at 2 o'clock the Prolocutor prorogued Convocation till Feb. 14th.

In the Upper House, a Committee was appointed to consider the present law of Simony.

The Bishop of London presented the Report of the joint Committee of both Houses, appointed to prepare Forms of Prayer for particular Occasions. We give it in full.

A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the blessings of harvest; to be used when it shall be allowed by the Ordinary:—

Morning and Evening Prayer shall be the same with the usual Office for Holydays, except where it is in this Office otherwise appointed.

PROPER PSALMS.

Morning prayer, lxv, lxxxi; Evening Prayer, civ, cxliv.

PROPER LESSONS.

Morning Prayer.—First Lesson, Deut. viii. 7 to the end; or, Deut. xxvi, 1 to 12; or, Deut. xxviii, 1 to 15. Second Lesson, John iv. 31 to 39; or, John vi, 26 to 36.

Evening Prayer.—First Lesson, Deut. xxxiii. 7 to 20; or, Isaiah xxviii. 23 to the end; or, Hosea, ii. 18 to the end. Second Lesson, 2 Cor. ix. 6 to the end; or, Rev. xiv. 14 to 19.

Instead of the first Collect at Morning and Evening Prayer, shall be used the following:—

O ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, who hast given unto us the fruits of the earth in their season, grant us grace so to use them that we may be preserved in health, both of body and soul: through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, Who is the living Bread which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world: To Whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end. *Amen.*

After the General Thanksgiving which shall always be used on this occasion, shall be said the following:—

O MOST merciful Father, Who of Thy gracious goodness hast heard the devout prayers of Thy Church, and hast granted us to gather in the kindly fruits of the earth in their season; we give Thee humble thanks for this Thy bounty, beseeching Thee to continue Thy loving kindness unto us, that our land may yield us her increase, to Thy glory and our comfort, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

After Morning or Evening Prayer, or after the Creed when the Holy Communion is celebrated, may follow the Sermon.

The order of the administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, when the same shall be celebrated.

Instead of the Collect for the day, shall be used,

O ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, &c., (as in Morning Prayer.)

The Epistle—1 Thes. v. 14 to 24.

The Gospel—John vi. 5.

A Form of Prayer with Humiliation, to be used on any special occasion when it shall be allowed by the Ordinary:—

Morning and Evening Prayer shall be the same with the usual Office for Morning and Evening Prayer, except where it is in this Office otherwise appointed.

PROPER PSALMS.

Morning Prayer, vi. xxv.; Evening Prayer, xlii., xliii., lxx.

PROPER LESSONS.

Morning Prayer.—First Lesson, Dan. ix. 1 to 20; Second Lesson, Luke xix. 41 to 45; or, Luke xx. 9 to 19.

Evening Prayer.—First Lesson, Deut. xxxii. 18 to 31; Second Lesson, Heb. x. 26 to 32.

¶ *Instead of the three Collects at Morning and Evening Prayer shall these which next follow be used.*

ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, Who hatest nothing that Thou hast made, &c., (being the Collect for Ash-Wednesday).

ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, Who art always more ready to hear than we to pray, &c., (being the Collect for the Twelfth Sunday after Trinity).

O GOD, Whose nature and property, &c., (from the Prayers after the Litany).

¶ *After Morning Prayer or the Litany (which may always be used on this day, either separately, or with the Morning Prayer,) ended, there shall be a Sermon or exhortation, setting forth God's righteous anger against impenitent sinners, and His merciful pardon in Christ Jesus to all that turn to Him with faithful repentance.*

¶ *After the Sermon, they shall all kneel upon their knees, and the Priest and people shall say this Psalm,* "Miserere Mei Deus," Psalm li, *and so on unto the end of the Commination.*

A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving, to be used on any special occasion when it shall be allowed by the Ordinary:—

Morning and Evening Prayer shall be the same with the ordinary Office of the day, except where it is in this Office otherwise appointed.

PROPER PSALMS.

Morning Prayer, xviii., cxlix., cl.; Evening Prayer, ciii,, cxxvi., cxxxiv.

PROPER LESSONS.

Morning Prayer.—First Lesson, Isaiah xii. Second Lesson, Luke xix. 29 to 41.

Evening Service.—First Lesson, Isaiah xxxviii. 9 to 21. Second Lesson, Phil. iv. 4 to 8.

¶ *In the General Thanksgiving, which shall always on such occasions be used, the special mercy for which thanks are returned may be particularly mentioned.*

¶ *After Morning or Evening Prayer may follow the Sermon.*

A form of Prayer to be used with Special Sermons, when it shall be allowed by the Ordinary:—

¶ *The Office shall begin with one or more of these Sentences.*

Ezek. xviii. 27; Matt. iii. 2; Joel ii. 13; Dan. ix. 9, 10—as in the Prayer-book.

¶ *Then shall be said these Collects following.*

PREVENT us, O Lord, &c. (from the Communion service.)

LORD of all power and might, &c. (being the Collect for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity.)

BLESSED Lord, Who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning, &c. (being the Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent.)

OUR Father, &c.

Then may be sung a psalm or hymn.

THE SERMON.

Then may be said the Litany; or, the last three Collects in the Commination.

Then may be sung a psalm or hymn.

Then shall the priest say—

LET US PRAY.

GRANT, we beseech Thee, &c. (a Collect from the end of the Communion service.)

Then the Blessing.

A Form of Prayer which may be used, when allowed by the Ordinary, on the re-opening of a church.

¶ *Morning and Evening Prayer shall be the same with the usual Office for Holydays, except where it is in this Office otherwise appointed.*

PROPER PSALMS.

Morning Prayer, xlv., xlvii, lxxxiv.; Evening Prayer, lxxxvii., cxxii., cxxiii.

PROPER LESSONS.

Morning Prayer.—First Lesson, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8 to 29; or, Ezra iii. 1 to 12; or, Haggai ii. 1 to 20. Second Lesson, St. Mark xi. 2 to 18; St. Luke xix. 37 to 47.

Evening Prayer.—First Lesson, Ezra vi. 14 to end. Second Lesson, Rev. xxi.

Instead of the First Collect for Morning and Evening Prayer, shall be used that which next followeth.

O MOST Blessed Saviour, Who, by Thy presence at the Feast of Dedication, didst approve and honor such religious services as this which we are now offering unto Thee, be present with us also at this time by Thy Holy Spirit; and because holiness becometh Thy House for ever, sanctify us, we pray Thee, that we may be living temples, holy and acceptable unto Thee; and so dwell in our hearts by faith, and possess our souls by Thy grace, that nothing which defileth may enter into us, but that, being cleansed from all carnal and corrupt affections, we may ever be devoutly given to serve Thee in all good works, Who art our Saviour, Lord, and God, blessed for evermore. *Amen.*

THE COMMUNION.

The Collect shall be the same as that in the Morning Prayer.

The Epistle.—Ephes. ii. 13 to the end.

The Gospel.—St. John x. 22 to 31.

The *Bishop of Oxford* moved that the report which has been presented be received and taken into consideration in the next session of Convocation, to be held on the 14th of February.

The *Bishop of Lincoln* seconded the motion.

The *President* then put the motion, which was agreed to.

The Report of the Missionary Bishops' Committee, from the Lower House, was laid before the Upper House. The following are the names of the Committee:—*Archdeacons*—St. Alban's (Dr. Grant;) Berks, (Mr. Randall;) Buckingham, (Mr. Bickersteth, chairman.) *Doctors*—Leighton, Williams, Wordsworth. *Reverends*—Canon Browne, Canon Selwyn, Hon. S. Best, H. Mackenzie, F. C. Massingberd. The late Archdeacon Hardwick was also nominated a member of this committee.

The following is the Report in full:—

The committee of the Lower House of Convocation, appointed under the direction of his Grace the President, "to consider and report upon the expediency of placing Bishops at the head of missions of the Church of England to heathen countries external to her Majesty's dominions; the mode in which it should be decided when it is expedient to send forth such a Bishop, and the rules which should govern his appointment, and the relations of the native Churches to the mother Church, and what guarantees can be suggested for maintaining between them the unity of faith and discipline;"—

Beg leave to report as follows:—

We have first considered what were the principles by which the primitive

ch was guided with respect to planting missions, so far as they may be in-
d from Holy Scripture and from early ecclesiastical records; and we have
endeavored to apply these principles to the present condition and circum-
es of the Church of England.

e gather from the New Testament that the Apostles were missionary Bish-
in the fullest sense of the term; that they went about from place to
, preaching the Gospel, planting Churches, and giving directions for their
rnment.

the Church increased, the Apostles delegated Episcopal authority to oth-
whom, under Divine guidance, they invested with the government of certain
ches; as Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete.

sing from the New Testament to the uninspired records of the early Church,
pears to us that the practice of primitive Christian antiquity with regard to
rganization of missions is involved in considerable obscurity.

e Church grew and extended herself continually through the power of
indwelling Spirit; but the method of her extension does not appear to
been uniform or invariable. Ecclesiastical history fails to supply us with
certain or precise information on this point. We find that inferior ministers,
even laymen, were often instrumental in sowing the first seeds of the Gos-
n countries where it had before been unknown; and that Bishops constantly
sed the functions of preaching the Gospel to the heathen. But there is
dant evidence to show that, when Christian congregations had been gath-
out of heathendom, and by whatever instrumentality, they were placed as
as possible under Episcopal government.

e proceed to apply these general principles to the present circumstances of
Church.

considering the mode of the extension of Christian missions amongst the
en external to her Majesty's dominions, a distinction should be drawn be-
n the case of heathen tribes lying contiguous to a Christian people, and
of heathen isolated and remote from any Christian Church, to whom an
ing may be made along the pathway of science, or of commerce, or by any
leading of God's providence.

e gladly adopt the old ecclesiastical rule, that the Bishops should endeavor
nvert the heathen adjacent to their dioceses.

ere are cases in which it may be expedient to send out presbyters in the
instance as Evangelists; and we are of opinion that such a mode of origin-
missions may be best adapted to the heathen lying in close contiguity with
ese of our Church.

t we think also that there are cases in which it may be desirable to send
a Bishop at once as the head of a mission: as for example—

Where a large staff of missionaries is necessary; or,

Where a large and imposing organization of heathenism has to be con-
ed, especially in regions lying remote from any diocese of our Church.

e expediency or inexpediency of sending out a missionary Bishop in the
instance can, however, only be determined by the particular circumstances
e case as it may arise.

ith regard to the heathen bordering upon a Christian people, we think that
nverts should, in the first instance, be governed by the Bishop of the adja-

cent diocese: and that all further arrangements respecting the governmen such missions should be determined by a Synod of the adjacent province.

With regard to the more remote missions, we consider that the proper auth ity for determining when it is expedient to send out a Bishop, would be tha an Archbishop, or other Metropolitan, with his Suffragans; and that, during missionary condition of such Episcopate, the Bishop sent out should owe can ical obedience to the consecrating Metropolitan.

Our instructions not requiring us to enter upon the legal question, whet the Church of England has the power to send forth Bishops into heathen te tories beyond the limits of the British dominions, we have framed our rep upon the assumption that she has this power.

In the entire uncertainty which necessarily exists as to the relations in wh any new Churches formed in heathen countries may stand to the civil and t poral rulers of those countries, we feel it to be impossible to lay down any r for the permanent relations of those Churches to Churches external to them.

The guarantees for the future orthodoxy and good discipline of Churches yet existing must be found chiefly, under the Divine blessing, in the prude and enlightened wisdom of the Bishop and presbyters who form any partic mission. We conceive that, with regard to the admission of converts, t would guide themselves by the analogy of such precautions as the Church taken in her forms for the baptism of infants and adults; and that, with reg to the transmission of spiritual authority, they would in like manner adopt analogy of similar precautions to be found in the Ordinal of the Book of C mon Prayer.

In conclusion, we earnestly pray that abundant supplies of wisdom, as wel zeal, may be vouchsafed to all those who are endeavoring to extend the k dom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the world.

(Signed on behalf of the committee,)

EDWARD BICKERSTETH, Chairma

Dec. 31, 1859.

CONVOCATION.—ADJOURNED MEETING.

On Tuesday Feb. 14th, both Houses met pursuant to adjournment, and tinued in session until Saturday, Feb. 18th, the longest session since the re of Convocation.

In the Upper House the members present were—his Grace the Archbishop Bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, St. David's, Oxford, Llandaff, coln, Salisbury, Gloucester and Bristol, Bath and Wells, Norwich, and Ban

We have full reports of the doings of Convocation, and of the debat both Houses. No abstract which we can present, and no description will gi the reader any adequate and true view of the inner life and practical worl of the English Church as revealed in these discussions. The Anglican Ch seems almost as much surprised, and to have almost as much curiosity t her own face in the glass, as we, her American children. For nearly one dred and fifty years her power has been held in abeyance; and the prudenc evident care and forethought, with which she now takes the power into her hands, is proof that she will neither abuse it, nor suffer it again to be wr

n her. Convocation only needs the introduction of the Lay element to make lf the living voice of a living Church. But she has not come to that convic- yet.

mong the subjects which occupied the attention of the two Houses, were the ition of Services for particular occasions to the Book of Common Prayer; ending of Missionary Bishops to the heathen not within the bounds of her esty's dominions; the repeal of the 29th Canon, which forbids parents to d as Sponsors for their own children; the law of Simony; the vexed ques- of pew-rents; and the means adopted, or to be adopted, for lessening the lorable scandals which have lately been so alarmingly prevalent among the rgy.

n Tuesday the House of Bishops was occupied with the 29th Canon; with a ition to save the Church from scandalous ministers; with the subject of Oc- ional Services; with Pew Rents, &c.

n Thursday, in the Upper House, the Bishop of Oxford presented a petition, ed by a number of Clergymen, against any alteration of the Liturgy. This ited from the Bishop an eloquent vindication of the Book of Common yer from the objections brought against it by the 463 signers of Lord Ebury's ition, and a remark that the more those names were scrutinized the less was weight found to be due to them. Amid a general concurrence in the prayer the petition just presented, the Bishop of St. David's brought forward an ad- ional reason, characteristic of his own historical pursuits. The Book of Com- n Prayer, he said, was a form used over all parts of the globe, wherever men English origin had settled themselves. It must be a very great advantage ich should induce any alteration which might have the effect of producing a ism between any of these distant Churches and the mother Church of Eng- d. Even the slightest alteration in a formulary might produce such a conse- ence; for the most disastrous schism which had ever rent the Church had en occasioned by the introduction in the Liturgy of only two little words. e historical allusion to the celebrated *filioque* controversy produced a visible d happy effect.

On Friday, an important debate was held on the Report of the joint Commit- e on Missionary Bishops, which brought out not only many interesting state- ents with respect to the Mission to Central Africa, but also principles of the ghest importance to the general working of the Church. The Bishop of Lon- n strenuously urged grave doubts as to the expediency of affirming the inciple embodied in the report, that the Church of England should send out a mber of Bishops, not bound to the Church of England by the supremacy of e Crown, or even by an obligation to use the services in the Book of Common ayer. We might thus be creating, he said, a state of things similar to that hich prevailed in the Eastern Church, in which there were many particular hurches, all possessing the Apostolic succession, but all holding different doc- ines on fundamental articles of faith. His lordship observed that it was doubt- ss the feeling of a want of a central authority to ensure uniformity of faith, hich had favoured the assumption of such authority by the Bishops of Rome, ho had conferred a signal service on the Western Church by preserving it from he schisms which had rent the Eastern Church in pieces. His lordship suggested hat authority over the missionary Bishops might be retained in the hands of

the Crown by a bill similar to that under which the Jerusalem Bishopric constituted. The Bishop of St. David's pointed out in reply that the Ameri Church has preserved its orthodox faith without any royal supremacy, and ur that the impossibility of applying such a bond of union to Churches founde countries not subject to the Queen's authority, ought not to be fatal to a sche which promised such benefits to mankind. The Bishop of London confes his ignorance of the American Church. The Bishop of Oxford thought t the framework of the Catholic Church would be sufficient security. Th ought to be a distinct understanding that no consecration should take place, a no alteration be made in the formularies of the missionary Church, without c sultation with the Bishops at home. It was the general feeling that all possi security for uniformity of faith and doctrine should be obtained, and with a vi to further consideration of this subject it was agreed that there should be session of two days, to begin on the 7th of June.

On Saturday, the last day of the Session, steps were taken, in consequence a petition from the Bishop of Exeter, to secure the restoration, in all futu editions of the Bible, of the marginal readings, and of at least so much of t Preface as explains their import. Finally, a committee was appointed to co sider further the difficult question of the appointment of missionary Bishops f dioceses not comprised within the Queen's dominions, and to report the result Convocation on its re-assembly for that special object on the 7th of June next.

In the Lower House the debates were upon the same, or similar subjects, t that which occupied the attention of the Upper House. They were more desu tory, but the subject of Occasional Services called forth the best talent of th English Church. Canon Wordsworth, Canon Woodgate, the Rev. Dr. Jelf, Pr fessor Browne, and others, bore witness to the necessity of a fuller expression o the wants of the worshipers on certain occasions than is rendered by the regu lar and stated Services. Important changes in the Report were suggested i the Upper House, and in due time the Report modified will no doubt be set fort by regal authority.

Dr. Wordsworth's motion, deprecating all change in the Prayer Book, dre from the Dean of Norwich a strong expression of opinion that the time was com when some concession, not only to discontented Churchmen, but to Protestan Nonconformists, ought to be made; *but the general feeling on the matter seems to agree with that of the Upper House—namely, that the Book of Common Prayer should be preserved in its integrity.* Indeed, the opposition to an change in the doctrine and character of the Prayer Book, is well nigh univers in the Church of England.

Our synopsis, in making which we have been aided by the English papers though meager, is yet amply sufficient to show the vast importance of this Con vocational movement. Beyond controversy the future prosperity and growth o the English Church, at home and abroad, greatly depend on the manner in whic she shall resume the discharge of those high and holy functions which necessa rily appertain to her, and which no power on earth can take away from her.

NOTE.—Notwithstanding twenty-four extra pages in this No., we have put aside a number o Articles, and at least fifty pages of Home and Foreign Intelligence.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

HURCH REVIEW.

. XIII. JULY, 1860. No. 2.

I.—THE PRESENT STATE AND PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.—No. III.

FORTUNES OF THE HEBREW NATION AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

the July Number of this Review there appeared an Ar- ntitled "Constantine, Charlemagne and Hildebrand;" the d of a series upon "The Present State and Prospects of tianity." In that Article was brought forth what we d "The American Catholic Theory of the Church." This ted of two parts. The first, the historical assertion that ganic injury was inflicted by these men upon Christianity he Christian Church, of which the results have been ng themselves out in Europe ever since, in the shape of rialism and Papalism, and the whole train of European ues, wars, strifes and conflicts, political and religious, to the present day. The second part of this theory being, when these evils had reached to the worst, then, by the idence of God, had the Almighty, of His goodness and y, planted here in this New World a pure branch of His ch, equally free from State domination and from Papal

tyranny, to be the purified and perfect Church of a new ra in a new world; to be the American Catholic Church. A this we undertook to illustrate in the pages of this Review.

We professed, that, as there was an Anglican, a Romani a Presbyterian, a Congregationalist theory of the Church a its position in the world, so that there exists in the facts history, and is capable of being developed from them, an Am ican Catholic Theory, of which these papers had the first ho this Review first proclaimed the idea. And then we freed o selves from the imputation of vanity by the express declarati that the facts of Church history, the present position of t Church in this land, its relation to the past, its promise in ference to the future, all these admit of no other solution; these suggest to the thoughtful, first, and in time to all m this idea of an American Catholic Church, as a solution many difficulties, a center of many hopes, the root of manif aspirations for Christ and Christianity over the whole work

For, in accordance with what we have seen of the ways God, we do not believe that this new idea, this new organi tion is to remain only American, but is to be the commenc ment of an era, it is to be an organization, which, having t power of coming into being here, is to reach and sweep acr Christendom. So did the Greek type of Church discipline a doctrine take the place of the earlier Oriental shapes in t East, and become the one predominant and controlling for So, more strikingly still, did Latinism overlay and extingui or, rather absorb the earlier British, and Gallic, and Spani forms, and become itself the predominant and formative mi sionary Christianity of the West. Thus do we consider th this new form, by the providence of God, is now being broug into existence here, is shaping and molding itself here, from the materials supplied by the people, the state, the gover ment, in a word, from all the facts of this New World. Th in its first completed organic perfection, is to become, and t the American Catholic Church of this whole land and wh people. And then, in its fully developed proportions and pow and its full blown vigor of spirit and life, this is to become a

be a model to the Church over the whole world,* a voice to the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of the Churches enslaved and corrupted by Imperialism and Papalism, convincing them all, that in freedom and in self-government there is the possibility of a higher Christianity than since the time of Constantine has existed, that Primitive Christianity,† which all men praise, and so few know wherefore it ceased to exist.

And we desire no propagandism for this, no enthusiastic destructionism, no loud-sounding advocacy or invective. But, simply, that WE should know our own ground, that we should feel what we are, and live up to it. That we should increase in primitive holiness, in primitive zeal, in primitive faith and primitive doctrine, and therefore in numbers, until prejudice can no longer close its eyes, inveterate Papal or State-and-

* One or two indications of this we already see very manifestly. If we look at the Colonial Churches of England, they have already, all of them, got the idea of self-government by means of Synods, or as we call them, Conventions. Whence did this idea come to them? Unquestionably from our Church. Weak as we are in numbers as yet, our independence of the State, our self-government, our Lay-element in Councils, have been lessons to the Colonial Churches of England; by and by a lesson to the Mother Church herself. In this State-free, Pope-free, new Catholicity over the whole world, as we said in our first Article, we put all the hope that we have for the European Churches.

† One of the things that has struck us the most in English ecclesiastical writers, is their great admiration for Primitive Christianity. In this feeling they share with all parties at the opening of the Reformation. They alone seem to persevere in that admiration. The Roman Catholics, Calvinists and Lutherans, have rather abandoned it. But some of the Anglicans are very strange in their management of this idea. The question, of course, at once starts up, "why should Primitive Christianity be so much better than any other?" The answer they give is, "because it was nearer the Apostles"—"nearer the Apostles, therefore purer," at once suggests, "further off, therefore, more corrupt," and thus a law of progressive corruption is at once suggested and implied, and the Church is put on a level with human institutions.

In fact, there is a distinct point up to which Christianity is Primitive, the beginning of the union of Church and State; that is the era of Constantine. This is the period of commencing decay. Then in Charlemagne is the union completed, and Christianity is upon a completely false basis, and then corruption becomes a normal thing, which only the labors of individual piety and the providence of God can correct. Why not give this answer; "Primitive Christianity was pure, because self-governing and free from the world, and in the normal and natural state in which God intended it to be?"

Church conservatism no longer resist the conclusion that Primitive Christianity can once more exist upon the earth, and that the freedom of the Church, which is an organized body and therefore capable of maintaining itself in *vigorous life* without State support, is the condition of its restoration.

First, did we consider that to our Mother Church of England would this conviction reach from us through her Colonial Churches, which are in the same position as we ourselves are in, and then, by the providence of God, that the same truth would pass onward to all the other churches of Europe. And so might it be, that in His own good time, by the mercy of God, the Christian Church would be restored to its first state of Unity and Holiness, and the Gospel of Christ should be victorious over the whole world.

These are our clear and distinct views of the final cause of the existence of this New World, this new race, and this new-born American Catholic Church. We hold them calmly and clearly, and we desire them to be known, and we recognize at this time that, which is to be seen historically at the coming of all new epochs that embody lofty and controlling ideas, discontent with the past, and with it the feeling of a greater time to come over the whole world and over all nations. There is the feeling that a future is coming upon this world, a greater and grander era than all past time has seen. Over the whole sea of human existence, each individual soul is lifted up toward the hope of that unseen future. It forms a portion of all dreams, all follies and fanaticisms, as well as of all the deepest and wisest, and most considerate speculations. This peculiar state of emotion has alway forerun an era, has always gone before an epoch. We see that it is in existence now, and we therefore look out for its approach unexcitedly and resolvedly. We say that what it forebodes is the reign of a pure and holy Christianity over the whole world, the solution by the hand of the Almighty in His own good time, of the problem which has for ages employed the loftiest and most pious minds of Europe, the problem of a Catholic and Apostolic Church, and the restoration of its Unity and its Primitive Holiness.

We have thus explained ourselves in reference to some objections, but we come now to a matter rather more important. It might be said in reference to this theory, "How is this idea consistent in any way with the idea of a Catholic Church, an Apostolical Succession? Does it not consider the Church in a measure to have failed in past ages—whereas it is promised that "the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it?"

We may answer that it does not. "It supposes that the Almighty hand of God interposes against the folly of man, and when, so far as man and his wisdom* are concerned, the Church has been betrayed, then has God preserved it by His own prescient and omnipotent wisdom, so that when men have been almost in despair of Christianity, then and there has the way been prepared for its final victory."

That God should permit Imperialism and Papalism to crush down the masses to the condition in which they were at the era of the Reformation, that then these two powers within the Church, founded apparently upon foundations of the central rock, should be broken up by the entrance into the system of Europe of new and unheard of forces,† which organized discontent and gave rebellion irresistible strength—and that till then the oldest portion of the world should be kept hidden from the European world although the Northmen certainly,

---

* "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

† In our previous Article we have stated, page 236, that the Reformation, or the explosion of the Mediæval settlement of Christianity, took place at the appointed time, because new forces then entered Europe from without, and gave overpowering strength to the sense of wrong in the European people. First, the gold of Mexico, with the re-discovered wealth of Hindustan. Secondly, the Classic Literature, with all its contents, its taste, its literary power, its Republican Spirit, and more than this, it's Heathenism, its false Philosophy, its purely Pagan tone. Thirdly, the uprising of the national spirit in all nations of Europe, Germany the first, England next, then in all the others, against Imperialism and Papalism, both of them anti-national in a high degree. Fourthly, the knowledge of the existence and literature of the Greek Church, so purely anti-Papal and anti-Latin as it has ever been. There powers, and the knowledge of them, flying from man to man, from city to city, from land to land, on the wings furnished by the newly discovered art of printing, enabled the Titanic powers, that were bound down by the brute force of Imperialism and the craft of Rome, to come forth. And thus the explosion which shattered Mediævalism took place.

and as certainly many of the Asiatics, and perhaps Welsh and other Europeans, had found it out—so that its discovery should synchronize so exactly with the Reformation, this was strangely providential upon the face of it. And then, that the predominant influence upon this continent should be that of England,* the nation whose Reformation alone embraced all the elements of Primitive Christianity, instead of France or Spain, the races that seemed at first most likely to spread and rule over these great regions. Again, the peculiar and seemingly most adverse providences also by which Episcopacy was not obtained until after the Revolution, so that now, instead of an Anglican Episcopacy with all the Church-and-State traditions and bitter feelings that might have been in existence, had the Revolution opened upon us with a numerous English Church-and-State titled Prelacy, our Episcopacy is completely and entirely American in all its ideas and feelings.† Seeing, too, how wonderfully

---

* One most curious fact in reference to the English language I have not seen noticed of late, and yet it is very interesting. The English language has Saxon words, but the Hebrew idiom! The way this came was this. Our translators, instead of translating the Hebrew idiom into the then existing idiom of the English language, translated word for word. Hence the Hebrew idiom became transferred, and owing to the universal Bible-reading of the English nation, its idiom became more or less Hebraic. Indeed, so much is this so, which we have seen noticed only by one writer of the age of Charles the Second, John Selden, who complains of it bitterly, that with a Hebrew grammar and Bible only a man of ordinary abilities can learn the Hebrew language! The English version is so literal and so verbal, it can supply the place of a Lexicon! It is not an extravagant statement to make, that the idiom of our language, its peculiar flow and rhythm, which arises from the collocation of its words, its metaphors and rhetorical coloring, is Hebraic; everything, save the solid and substantial bone and muscle of the language, which is Anglo-Saxon, or Scandinavian. This fact connects itself very strangely with the Christian position, past and future, of the English and American Races.

† Between Judah and Samaria, our Church and the Roman, the only two branches of the Church that are in competition for the ultimate religious control of the United States, this is one great difference in our favor. Looking over the list of Roman Catholic Bishops and Clergy, one quarter of their Bishops scarcely, perhaps one tenth only of their Presbyters, if we may judge by the names, appears to be American. We do not believe that a twentieth part of our Clergy are foreign born.

How far they may get over that disadvantage, or we render our advantage unavailing, time only can tell. But certain it is, that whatever Apostolic Church

this New Race in this New World is spreading, how much all difficulties before the Church are melting away, and how, over the whole English-speaking world, the Colonial Churches are being forced to assume the same position in which we have been placed by God's mysterious will, we may say in reference to this objection, "nay, but we do establish the Church of God." We show that when man had got control of the Church, and to a certain degree had corrupted and destroyed it, so far as it could be destroyed, in holiness, in unity, in truth, then had God reserved for Himself, in the wisdom of His Infinite knowledge and power, the means, far-lying out of human ken, beyond man's farthest-sighted pre-vision, whereby the prophecies should, all in His good time, be fulfilled, and the hope of every believing heart satisfied. These things lie upon the face of these papers, and they are enough to answer completely and satisfactorily the objection which we have stated.

When St. Augustine founded the Science of History, that is to say, the Christian science of History, as he did in his treatise '*De Civitate Dei*,' he found all the principles lying ready to his hand, in the practical faith of the Christian Church. His only task was to apply and systematize them. The great curse of history now in this ninteenth century is, that it is written systematically upon false and anti-Christian principles. And these principles are so mingled with the very atmosphere we breathe, that in discussing any Historical subject whatsoever, we must pause and take thought, and see whether we are not going unconsciously upon godless and irreligious ideas, whether, symmetrical as the building may seem, Atheism be not its foundation. Our readers, therefore, will permit us to

---

is to be the One, Holy, Catholic Church in these United States, it is to be national and loyal in the highest degree. It is to love the nation, the land, the government, the people. It is to be, as it were, a nervous system, co-extensive in all points with the muscular system, which shall have a fibre of sensation or of motion existing with and running close by every part and portion of the muscle, bone and sinew of the country. So that the Church system shall sympathize with every throb of the national bosom, shall feel all the national emotions of joy or grief, apprehension or triumph, as its own. The Church must be completely American; this is one condition of the very existence of an American Catholic Church!

pause and dwell upon some cardinal principles of historical sci ence, so that these may exist before their minds clearly an distinctly, before we apply them to the further illustration c this question. The grandeur of the theme which we are dis cussing—the loftiest in truth and most important that has oc cupied the human mind for centuries—as well as the space w have allotted to it, authorizes and demands this liberty. A also the fact, that the ideas which we wish to stand out s prominently in this part of our work to the minds of our rea ers, have in these last days been almost trodden out of th memory of men by the base hoofs of a multitude of Pagan an Naturalistic notions.

The first is the idea of the 'Moral Freedom of Man,' as ap plied to the science of History and exemplified in its fact We do not profess here to examine it fully, having elsewhe discussed it as a subject of Moral Science,* but simply to presen this fact and truth, and the principles that spring from it, as con nected with the present question. We would therefore simpl say that we must consider, that to men and to nations this worl is a school of Probation. Of the system of the Universe, it ends and its objects, as it is before the eye of the Almighty we can have but little knowledge. That is to say, the Mora system of the Universe, and a moral system it must have, o rather must be, as it is objectively, our limited intellect canno comprehend.† An Eternity is past—'a parte ante'—backwar

---

* See the 'Elements of Christian Science,' a treatise upon Moral Philosophy (by the Author of these Papers,) H. Hooker, Philadelphia. The sixth book c that volume is a treatise upon the Human Will, in its relations to the Divine Wil and discusses the questions of Freedom, Necessity, Human Liberty and its lim itations, so fully, that once for all we beg to refer to it for the full exemplifica tion of the principle we have employed and asserted in the text of this Paper.

† The idea of a 'Theodicea,' a distinct objective 'Justification' of God, was a impossible problem, the stating of which as a problem, and the attempt at solv ing it, was worthy the great mind of Leibnitz.

Magnis tamen excidit ausis.

How signally he failed, let "Candide or the Optimist" tell. A poor solutio of the 'problem of the Universe,' which a witty story wipes out from the Philo sophic Credo, of Europe, once and forever.

In fact and truth, for the reasons which are given in the text, there is no The odicea objectively, save in the knowledge which God possesses, external to th

into which our vision cannot penetrate, of whose events and facts we have no knowledge. An eternity is before us, which we are too short-sighted to see into. But, subjectively, that is as regards himself, each man discerns the meaning of the Universe. This each man can see; the life-long and ever-present conviction of each man takes this for granted as a moral truth, interwoven into the roots of his being, and deriving fresh strength from all the events of his life, "This world is *to me* a training school, a course of moral probation, a system, of which each influence, that comes in contact with me, either makes me better morally, or worse, according to the use I make of it."

First, then, of all the convictions of our race, strongest of all those central truths, which no philosophy can benumb and narcotize in man, no false Religions overlay, no literature fritter away and no ignorance stifle, is this, that however imperfect and dim to our view may be the moral system of the world, as a whole, it is to each man distinctly evident that the world is to him a place and a state of moral probation* and trial.

And this universal consciousness, this conviction, which has no exception save in the case of the idiot and the born fool, at once originates in man two grand ideas. The first, that under all circumstances, national or individual, whether belonging to government, to climate, or to race, wherever man is, and whoever or whatever he is, he is alike responsible. Responsible, for all his actions individually, how many soever they be, to the judg-

---

thought of each and every created being. In other words, the Universe is a mystery, of which the cause is hidden from man. And the only Theodicea, to the man, is the conviction mentioned in the text, his conscience and moral nature, and moral freedom, his internal knowledge of himself his motives and his actions measured by the law of God. Lastly, the Final Judgment at the Great Day,—this shall be to each man, the Great Theodicea, the final and full proof, that to him God has been and is just and righteous, true and merciful. By the good leave of Leibnitz, and all the great intellects of Europe, this is the only Theodicea that can exist for man.

* This is the great fundamental principle of Bishop Butler's Analogy, a book which has done more for the Ethics of Christianity, than any other book in modern times. In fact this book, in its practical wisdom, has been the one great influence that has rescued the English and American educated classes from Atheism, the next step downward from the current Stoic and Epicurean systems of Fatalism and Physical Law.

ment of a Great God, and a Great Day. The heathen, Philemon, three hundred years before Christ, taught this just as distinctly as Christianity does, so clearly does the experience of all men discern the fact.

And again, this implies a Moral Law, which is both holy, just and true; which reaches each man from all the institutions of society, and all the Harmony of external nature—that law of God, the moral Law, the law of the Ten Commandments, a transcript of which is written on each human heart. This Law places upon each man, reveals to each man, more or less perfectly, the requirements of truth, purity, justice, holiness, goodness, mercy. This Moral Law, and the knowledge and the obligation of it, reach unto and bind every human being in every condition and in every place.

Hence, under the light and the warmth of these convictions, comes forth another fundamental truth, alike belonging to the universal consciousness of man, and to the experience of each individual, which no Stoic, Mohammedan, or Calvinist system of Predestination can drug to sleep, the truth that man has a certain degree of natural liberty, which exists in him as a spiritual being, as a part of his constitution. And again, that a certain farther degree of liberty is conferred upon him by God, as a moral gift, and a portion of his probation. Hence, that man is not compelled to bow to, and act upon the weightiest motive, as the scale turns to the greater weight, but that he may refuse it and act upon a motive not so weighty, or even upon no motive at all. This power of Self-determination,*

* There is more sense in one line of St. Augustine, as I suppose, quoted by Peter Lombard, than in whole cart loads of "Treatises upon the Will." "Liber," he says, "a necessitate per naturam, a peccato per gratiam, a miseria per providentiam." "Free from Destiny (or doom) by Nature, from Sin by Grace, from Misery by Providence." This is the whole question of man's freedom in a nutshell.

By the way, it has always appeared to us that these New England Calvinists, beginning with Jonathan Edwards, had been at a work they did not quite comprehend—the work of reducing Calvinism to nothing by an 'ad absurdum' process! The New England man, the 'real live Yankee,' is too much of a man not to see and be convinced of the existence of Moral Freedom. Their attempted work then has been, as they state the problem, to reconcile the system of Predestination with Freedom. Has it not really come out to be a refutation of the predes-

this natural liberty we must conceive him to possess in a greater or less degree. The limitations thereof, and the principles upon which they are organized, it is not in our way now to discuss.

Hence does it follow, these data being true, that no science whatsoever that exists, or that can be brought into being by the brain of man, has the power of foreseeing and infallibly declaring the course of the actions of any man, of any nation, or of any race. Whatsoever the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, or the Logic of John Stuart Mill may try to do in this way, the existence of the spiritual power of Free-will in man, and the fact of the government of God, Who is a Person, Almighty and Omniscient, these two which co-exist in time and space, together with that other fact of a Physical system of the Material universe, forbid it. The Physical elements and powers of the world that surround us can be analyzed and classified; the Physical elements also of man's own body and his brain; but from all these no formula can be constructed, no trammel of mathematical or causal law framed, which either can compel the action of any individual, or by means of which we can prophesy and exactly foretel his course. Nor again, will the most subtle and extended analysis of his mental powers, or both combined, yield such a result. Only

---

tination system, in the mode of an 'ad absurdum' argument? "Therefore, the whole is equal to a part of it! which is absurd."

At any rate, the mass of New England intellect has clearly come to that conclusion. They do certainly, each and every man of them, believe in the freedom of the Will, and as certainly, the mass of New England intellectual and educated men do not believe in Absolute Predestination, either as a Philosophic or a Religious dogma.

Would it not be just as well to take the true position in reference to the talents of Jonathan Edwards, and instead of calling him 'a profound metaphysician'—which he was not in any sense, never having any the slightest Philosophic or Metaphysical talent, if Plato, if Kant, if Cudworth, or Coleridge have been Metaphysicians—to state the real fact, that he is an able and dexterous logician and a builder up of a system upon Metaphysical axioms—which he takes for granted in the most innocent and unconscious way, and of whose truth he has not the slighest capability, natural or acquired, of examining or even perceiving? It is quite time that New England should give up her traditional talk of 'gigantic metaphysical power,' and be influenced in some little degree by the fact that Europe, most strange as it is, has never found out her metaphysical Phœnix. A great man, we think, should have credit for the great talents he does possess, not for those of which he has not a vestige.

to the eye of Omniscience lies plain and manifest, from the beginning, the course of the actions of any man or nation. Our surest guide to such knowledge is merely tentative, mere probability, experience of the past applied sagaciously in guessing at the future, giving no absolute or demonstrative certainty, but only such presumptions as may be contradicted by the facts and events of the morrow. Statesmen of the widest sagacity and experience have found this out, and have characterized such human prophesying as 'a vain expenditure of intellect.' History also affords multitudes of these vain prophcies, and all the experience of our race proves their uncertainty. While God in His wisdom, as a personal being, guides and governs the world—by a system we cannot comprehend as it is in itself—towards ends which our very constitution may, nay does prevent us from being able to conceive, much less to understand—while man is endowed with natural liberty and moral freedom, the problem of prophesying and determining scientifically his actions 'a parte ante,' cannot be solved, is an impossible problem.

Such, then, is the position of man in this world, such are his endowments; gifted with freedom, his own nature a Moral Law within him—and all the Institutions of Society impressing upon him from without that same Moral Law; responsible to the future Judgment, and endowed with Natural Liberty, he stands before his Maker, a problem to himself and to his fellow-men, defying and making null all the calculations of reason, all the formulas of Science. He can break God's Laws. He can contravene God's will*. He can go against and outrage his own moral nature. He can act against the weightiest motives which can appeal to him, and against his own best interests. Alas! for human liberty, that so often its fullest proof

* This word "will," especially as applied to God, is one in which deceit the most subtle lurks and is hidden. It has a two-fold meaning. In the first place it implies purpose, a desire which God has expressed. Thus, "God wills the salvation of all men;" "he that shall do the will of God is my brother." Again it means decree on the part of God. It is plain that in the first sense we can break oppose, annul the will of God; in the second sense, no one can oppose the will of God; that is, His absolute decree, carried out by His Almighty power. Were this distinction always attended to, it would avoid a great deal of confusion of thought, and no small amount of incorrect reasoning and false doctrine.

should be the breach of the moral laws of God, the rejection of the weightiest motives that can appeal to us, and the breaking of the most intimate laws of our own being upon the very slightest and most trifling occasions and pretexts. But so it is; and the very men who deny it, display in themselves full proof of this fatal and piteous freedom, and of their own practical belief in its existence. No Fatalist or Predestinarian ever acted upon any other principles than those of Free-will.

In extending these doctrines from the domains of Ethical science to those of History, we must take for granted that this moral freedom, or natural liberty, with all its collateral adjuncts exists, not barely in the individual man, but in all the natural corporate bodies of which he is a member; the Family, the Nation, and the Church. Man is not governed by external or internal mechanical influences of necessitarian law, deduced from outward material nature, or from his own being, physical or mental—his course is merely modified by them. There is no unerring law of Causation without or within him, that predetermines the actions of the man or of the institutions in which he exists.

The Family, the Nation, the Church, as well as the individual man, are under Moral Law, are alike Responsible, alike measurably free. And of the progress of these, as of that of the man, no formula can be constructed by human science, by means of the most extended induction, the most subtle logic, the most voluminous statistics by which we can prophesy, and determine their course in space and time. Probability, founded upon the experience of the past, is our sole guide in reference to the future of any man, or of any nation, race or family. And yet, as we have before said, the next century, the next year, or the next day may utterly refute the most sagacious and most scientific vaticinations. Such a conclusion may be humiliating to the pride of human wisdom and the vanity of human science. But the two facts which exist in Social and Political, as in Ethical science, of the Moral Freedom of man, and the Government of the world by a Personal God, Almighty and Omniscient, render all mathematical and mechanical systems impossible, and baffle all calculations founded upon such theo-

ries. It is possible, then, that the man or the nation may, virtue of this natural freedom, oppose the will of God; may a great degree, render it void or even annul it.* And t which each one who for a moment considers the meaning of words will grant at once in reference to the man, holds true as gards the institutions in which the man exists. The object end of the Family, for instance, can be defeated; the will purpose of God in bringing its inmates together can be dered void by their disobedience to God's laws, as we see in daily experience of life. Wretchedness, wickedness and mis may be made to flow from that which was constituted and tended to be a perpetual fountain of felicity and of moral w being. Nations, in like manner, can defeat God's purp concerning themselves, by doing the evil which brings r upon them. As it is with the man, so it is with the insti tions in which man exists. There is no purpose which a nat is given to fulfil, no object revealed to it as the will of God the clearest way, that it is not capable of abandoning and re ing undone. Let the whole existence of a nation be wrap up in a purpose of God our Governor. Let it have come i being among the Peoples of the earth for that very purp Let it have been for it elected from the nations, and chosen that peculiar end. That nation can, by its natural freedo neglect that purpose, nay, abandon it; and, so far as itself a its own interests are concerned, annul in this respect the w of God. And then, the will of God is fulfilled in the world events,—but not by it.

And because this is so as a matter of Historical fact, the fore at once we come to the establishment of two gr principles of Christian Historical Science—the principle Substitution, and that of Compensation. The principle Substitution is to this effect: the doctrine of Final Cau being, as was said in one of our previous Articles, the gr basis of a Christian Philosophy of History; it is to be s that nations have oftentimes ends in the great drama history, for the fulfillment of which they are brought i being by the Almighty, raised up, nourished, sheltered, guid

* See Note on p. 204.

ends which are subserved by all things internal in the National Constitution, all things external that act upon them. National descent and blood and temper, National History, Law, Literature, customs and manners, nay the very shape and position, geographically, of their land, the products of their soil, the flow and direction of their rivers, the brightness or gloom of their sky, the flatness or the mountainous nature of their country; all these things and ten thousand thousand more, are often co-working and adjuvant causes to bring about the destiny of a nation, the Final Cause, for which by the will of the Eternal it exists in History. And looking at man as we have looked at him, each event in the chain of final causes is more or less a final cause itself, subservient to the last and completest, that in which is gathered and summed up the ultimate reason for which all things exist, the last Final Cause in which alone are solved all the problems of this life, all the mysteries of the course of this world's history. This is called in Scripture "the Consummation of all things."*

Now we may take it for granted that some nations may have a predominant and peculiar work towards which they have been adapted, as above said, and towards which they have been trained, which is their final cause. Egypt, and Greece, and Rome, and Arabia, Spain, Sweden and France, Russia and England rise up at once before us as nations that have had each of them a peculiar work to do in the History of the world, which we may reasonably conjecture they were intended by the will of God to do,—these nations and none else. And with our own nation, the feeling that such a position is reserved for us in the drama of the world, by the providence of God, seems growing and increasing. It matters not whether it be the mighty intellect of Daniel Webster that finds "That the

* Not "End of all things" but "Consummation," the final summing up (συντέλεια) and completion. The word occurs in Matt. xiii, 39; Hebs. ix, 26. This is one of the instances in which the use of the Saxon word instead of the Latin hides away an idea that is actually in the text. "End of the world" simply implies its termination; "συντέλεια," "consummation," implies a great deal more than mere termination. It implies completion, summing up, movement towards a final cause, and the having arrived at that point.

nation dwells alone, and is not counted among the nations,"* or that the vulgar demagogue avails himself of this feeling and of the fragments of fatalism that still float around among us, and splits the ears of the groundlings with his bawling arguments for filibusterism based upon "manifest destiny." Nor whether the Church of Rome feels the truth of this our national conviction, and leaving Russia, the other first-born twin of the Giant Races, sends such a mass of her treasure and her intellect here, as being sure that to subdue our country to Popery is to subdue the world, such and so great are her expectations of our future position in the world. Whatever application all these may make of their conviction, the conviction exists. The growing and spreading certainty is everywhere among us that Greece and Rome and Arabia, Spain and Sweden, England and France and Russia, all the nations of the earth together have not had so high a place in the history of the world as we have before us, so lofty and grand an influence on the destinies of the human race as God has intended this nation to have, if we do not ourselves cast it away. An opinion in which we fully agree and which we hold distinctly and clearly.

But nations, as we have said, may fail of the very ends of their national being as well as men. In this case history teaches us the principle of Substitution. Other nations are raised up in their stead, and other men to do the work. They are "substituted" for those who rejected and refused the work which God had placed upon them.†

---

* In one of his speeches Webster applies to us that part of the prophecy o Balaam concerning Israel, "Lo, the people shall dwell alone and not be reckone among the nations," to illustrate our great privilege that we are separated by th wide Atlantic from the politics of Europe. We have no neighbors strong enoug to attack us and drag us into war. We are therefore naturally at peace. We de velop our growth from our own internal principles and resources, unmodified b external pressure, unchecked by the jealousy and hostility of powerful nation Each nation in Europe is but a part of the great European Commonwealth o Nations, but like Israel of old "We dwell alone, we are not reckoned among th nations."

† Look at Hindustan for instance, see how for ages Idolatry has reache therein its full blown ripeness of lust, cruelty, falsehood, and subtle profession villainy of all kinds, social and political, among a people homogeneous in rac

Kindred to this is another principle we may see in history by which the very acts that are done against God's will are in their consequences so turned and guided by his Omniscience and his Omnipotence, that good is brought out of evil. The very purposes which the man or nation had abandoned or opposed, are secured by the consequences and results that flow naturally from his opposition or his desertion; this we may call the doctrine of Historical Compensation. These two doctrines we can see everywhere exemplified in human history. They are results of the two concurrent facts we have specified, that man has the endowment of natural liberty, and that a personal God governs the world. In the course of the present investigation we shall apply them often. And more than this, our readers may consider that these laws are always taken for granted by us, always understood in these papers.

---

literary and refined in habits, and surely and fixedly settled on the land. And then see how from the dawn of history, other races have been overriding them. The Greek, the Persian, the Mongol, the Portuguese, the French, the English, and each nation in its turn has been cast out. Each horde of conquerors have conquered for themselves, and in no degree subdued or remedied the national defects.

And by the way, how hateful the character of these great English statesmen and generals in Hindustan during the last century. Clive and Hastings, and even Cornwallis and Wellesley seem to have had towards the national interests, moral, religious and political of the native Hindu, the same temper that the best kind of Roman proconsuls in the worst days of Rome displayed in their rich Provinces. The first two in addition were more rapacious than Verres. They seem to have had the systematic business-like cruelty and rapacity of a gang of pirates, who intend by and by to retire to respectability and country houses. In truth Mohammed Ghiznee, Acbar and Sultan Baber, Mongols and Mohammedans as they were, seem to have had more horror of Idolatry, more feeling of its national enormity than the Christian English conquerors and rulers of Hindustan. Whether, after this last dreadful warning they have received, they will repent and permit the Church of England to organize a native Church in Hindustan, with Hindu Bishops, Priests and Deacons, a Hindu liturgy and Bible and Hindu ecclesiastical seminaries of learning, in other words a native Christian Church; or whether that great work neglected and despised and undone, the English shall be flung out and another nation substituted for them, we know not. But the only way of completely and perfectly Christianizing a nation of Heathen from the earliest days, is a National Clergy, with all its adjuncts religious and ecclesiastical.

Perhaps there are but few men that have not felt that they have had a work to do in this world, and a way to do it in. Still fewer that having failed of their endeavor, have not at the end of life, their work being left undone, the conviction weighing upon their minds—"Such might have been my course, such the result of my life; I have come to its end, I have left my work undone, or at the best half done." We are not of those who logically weave all things into the web of an iron destiny, who say "man is *doomed* to have such aspirations, *doomed* to their failure, *doomed* to believe they might have been realized, and *doomed* to regret that they were not realized." There is no doom but the want of honesty of heart, the failure in steadfastness of purpose, no destiny save in the absence of that moral courage required of us by our nature and our position, no non-realization of the ends of our being if we have these, the want of which to the wicked and the weak, both of men and nations, are an iron doom, a destiny insurmountable.*

But men may have been mistaken in this idea, nations also may have been deceived even in their firmest convictions that they have an object in the world's history to fulfil. This we admit, although it is no bad proof of the contrary when every man, woman and child, of a given people, are under such a persuasion; when all literature, all law, all custom and habit, is imbued with the one conviction, when the thoughtful and learned come to the conclusion and the thoughtless masses reaffirm it. One universal persuasion embodied in the consciousness of a whole nation, whether savage or civilized, has generally turned out to be a prophecy.

But still, both men and nations may have been mistaken. We take, therefore, a case in which there can be no mistake, the case of the Hebrew Nation. We are compelled, however, to pause here in our discussion, but shall resume the subject in the next No. of the Review.

---

* "Nullum abest numen ac sit prudentia, at te
Fortunam, Deam facimus, Coelo locamur."

"All the Gods assist forethought and wisdom, but it is our own follies that make a goddess of Fortune and place her in the heavens."

Art. II.—ABOUT 'DR. OLDHAM AT GREYSTONES, AND HIS TALK THERE.'

Dr. Oldham at Greystones and his Talk there:—New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1860. 12 mo., pp. 342.

Books, now-a-days, are coming as thickly as meteors, or newly-discovered planets, but, after all, they will never be more common, if every man should make his own, than human voices are, and though all men can speak, we yet find some voices that, alone of all, have a might, clearness, or melodious charm, or strong, sure influence for us; and, as we have some for our own private ear and hearts, so have we, in common with many others, some that for the holy rapture that gives life to them, or for the sacred wisdom that is wafted forth upon them, or for their wondrous, winning kindness, or their wanton fun, or for some quality of wide reach, are welcome to many ears at once. So will it ever be with books: but, to be chosen from the crowd, and to be known, and be remembered, or to be known and loved even if soon forgotten, a book must be a very beautiful or very good one, more than was required of old, when books were few.

And the true man is not afraid to write his book, and to ask men to read it, even if every one almost is writing. He knows as surely, that he has that, which, if he can get it to them, shall take hold of the minds and hearts of men, as the strong-armed workman knows that his axe shall cleave, and his heavy hammer shall drive home, if he have but a chance with them. The man with the true creative fire or mighty reason urging him, takes no account of quality or numbers. 'Give me a place and let me try,' is all he asks. He knows what he can do, and will do, if he may; or, at the least, knows that he can do something, and that he will do something that shall be worth the doing and worthy to be known, when done. 'Quod meruit ferat.'

The strong wish to write, is only the strong wish to spe to many men at once, and to speak words that shall, perha abide; so that—if we dare hope it—they shall be read m than once, and so that even more than one eye may read the

But, now for our special subject. We (this apparently di nified dual means only the humble pair of critical eyes that h just read Dr. Oldham) take to what are called desultory, skipping-books, with much reluctant winking. It is not re sonable to expect a man with a mind of his own, unless a ve lazy one, to go along with every capricious antic of an auth as two young goats, lashed together by the necks, are expect to accommodate themselves, one to the other. If one of the little cloven-footed imps take it into his unreasonable head jump, without warning, down a sudden precipice, his comrad snatching up, by the very roots, the juicy grass that he w just nibbling, must instantly, before the other gets his footin straighten his little legs and spring down after, or be throttle We never got so tied to one of these writers that we could n slip the noose and let him go, in his own company. We nev wish good speed to them—but only feel that we have been we rid of them.

Yet if we have a comrade, who, for the very life that is i him, must leap a five-barred fence or a broad brook, witho breaking pleasant or stirring talk, and cannot, for the life him, help it, our blood is as quick as his and our sinews s nimble, and we go together.

The mind, whose outward working we have here, is a stron and manly one, and our blood warms, and our breath gets u in keeping it company. Where a book has a good deal of th author's individual thought and opinion, (especially where, in this case, the book is altogether made of them,) we like, soon as we may, to form some idea of the character and habi of his mind; and from the freedom of this writer when he ge under him some of the nobler subjects, as morals and met physics, and the precision as well as force of his movements i handling them, we should fancy him to have a natural symp thy, and, moreover, a familiar practice with them. When, to appreciative taste comes into exercise, we can easily believ

from the sureness and delicacy with which he uses it, that he has trained it diligently among the older authors, of whom the classic poet's advice will ever hold good.

"Nocturna versate manu, versate diurna."

There is no plot or story needed for this sort of book; therefore there is none here: but there is some excellent character-drawing, though even that is not a chief or pro inent object of the author. It is subordinated to his main purpose, which is, to vent opinion f.eely. There is one main person, who is seen and heard throughout the book, and who has a capital wife, extremely well drawn.

His Doctor is an animated voice, (of one for the most part crying in the wilderness,) and extremely well the voice utters itself, and sometimes with exceeding beauty, and sometimes with exceeding force and clearness, against perverted religious principle, and perverted political principle, and perverted principles of taste. An oddity or conceit, if there be any, now and then, may be allowed to escape the fastidious taste quietly; for an occasional thing of that sort does not impair the impression of the entirely symmetrical and finished thought and wording of the best passages; and an occasional extravagance, if it be of the right sort, is like a pleasant little thrust under the ribs.

Conceits we confess to having no sympathy for. We will even confess to not fancying (with exceptions) Lawrence Sterne; to not fancying 'Doctor' Southey; to not fancying Bulwer Lytton, playing at Sterne. By 'conceit,' we mean a thing that is neither full fancy nor thought nor feeling, but may be an abortive attempt at either. If there be any such in this book, (and we believe that there are some such,) the reader must no expect us to find them for him: they are not of the purpose of so good a mind as our author's, nor of the substance of so good a book as this. Oddness, too, or grotesqueness, is always unlovely, not only to a well-bred, but to a healthy taste.

By an extravagance, however, we mean that breaking of conventional bounds, now and then, that occasional self-release from walking, steadily, the flat earth, which is proper to a frolicking humor, or a strong-winged fancy. Where, even some-

thing like a good practical joke, at the expense of dull and dignified conservators of article and canon rubric, or other D. D.s, is well and fit y done, and on good and sufficient provocation, we like it, and applaud. Not every English beadle is, necessarily, a booby, nor every constable a predestinated thick-headed, thumping clown, nor every doctor of divinity, by the mere nature of things, an —— what shall we say? But, have there not been instances, under our own eyes, dear reader, where the pomp and circumstance of a parish-officer, or town-officer, (for example,) was, by a boy's very well-timed hit, made a jest and by-word, to good purpose? Have we not counted it prosaic justice, sometimes, when we have seen some very obstructive and outrageous official on duty, drawn out of his dignity, into a vain and ridiculous chase after one special boy, that is not to be caught more easily than one of many pigs, and coming back very much blown and very bitter? Suppose, even, that some rigid disciplinarian has been, in our sight, brought low, even to the soiling of his raiment, just when he really deserved it, or soon after, do we, conservators as we are, console or commiserate him? Have we not always in mind, and do we not sometimes apply the *gloss*, that, (except in French,) 'right' is not a synonym with 'law?'

If law and dignity were going to perish out of the land, the first or second time that short and simple justice was administered to one who accidentally wore office or authority at the time, we should be sorry: but the truth is, that loyalty and reverence (in England and Massachusetts, and the like places, where they still exist) will survive a little pushing and pulling, and even tripping up of heels, done when it was deserved, to men who were wearing uniform, or badge of office. It is comfortable to feel assured (for they cannot be spared) that Doctors of the Divine law and maintainers of sound doctrine shall never cease out of the land, even though a well-urged foot may now and then suddenly push their tripods away from under them, just when they are largest and will come down most heavily.

That our Author sometimes treats the over-zealous and officious conservators of morality and orthodoxy as they sometimes

need to be treated, we will not deny for him. It is not every one that dares to do this; it is not every one that will be at the trouble to do it; it is not every one that can do it. Our Author can and does. He is orthodox, conscientious and reverential, and therefore he does it discreetly, advisedly, and as soberly as the circumstances will admit. Doctrines and morals are so swathed and swaddled by their dogmatical and pragmatical old nurses, that every one of them would be made mummies of, if there were not a rough uncle or friend of the family to tickle and toss them pretty often.

There is, in this book, much protest against mistakes and misleadings: but this is not all, nor the best part of it. There is moreover good, manly thinking, which is not common in our country, whether in sermons, or under other forms and conditions, although the assertion of an acquaintance with most subjects in general is. It is, of course, evident that pronouncing of judgments, and (to a less extent) expressing of opinions, are favorite habits of Americans. Such things are only dentium-tenus or lingua-tenus; they only come from the inside of the mouth, and are vented with the same disgusting and reckless looseness with which the other contents of the American mouth are exposed. When we meet, therefore, gentle and refined, and well-trained thoughts, and well-formed and well-defined opinions, as well as hearty, manly speech, we grapple to the man. There are fastidious and withdrawing persons, who, in presence of the vulgar, opinion-giving mob, would refuse to speak or open mouth: the brawling conceit and impertinence dishearten them. Yet the first personal pronoun at the head of an opinion is not to be disused by men capable of having good opinions, because the herd of men is vocal with 'I-myself-I,' any more than poets shall be afraid to allow the forging of their glorious thought to ring in rhyme, merely because there are so many people who can imitate the tinkle of end-words, and chew up the extremities of most prosy lines into what will jingle, and can then propose to us what they have made for most melodious verse.

No; poetry will come forth and be heard, in spite of assiduous rhymesters, and so shall good thought come and be welcome,

notwithstanding the multitude of impudent and shallow pretenders. In this book there is a great deal of good thought There are plenty of passages to be quoted: too many to b crowded into this Article; and of such as we have marked i reading, some of the very best must be left standing wher they stand, in the pages of "Dr. Oldham."

In speaking of Art, he says, excellently,

"As to that Beautiful in itself, which is embodied in the finite maker's form what is it? * * * What can it be, but the reflection, more or less faint, but alway faint, of the Infinite in the finite? What is all Art but an attempt at the impossible? No sum of finites can equal the infinite. The Almighty artist himself need eternity and immensity to disclose the riches of His mind and thought. Whe will the disclosure be complete? When will the Infinite pass fully out into th finite? Eternally unfolding, but eternally undisclosed, is the infinite substanc and source of Truth, Beauty and Goodness."—*Doctor Oldham, &c., p.* 103.

For an expression of appreciative taste, take the following incidental to that passage in "The Merchant of Venice," i which the stars are spoken of as "quiring to the young-eyed cherubim:"

"What exquisite grace, what simple idiomatic perfection of language, in that passage of Shakspeare's! What a picture it presents to the mind's eye; and what a proof of the superiority of word pictures over form and color pictures or rather, I ought to say, of the wider reach and greater variety of the power of words for the expression of the conceptions which the poetic imagination give form to: yet the secret of their power in the use of them is ever in using them as Shakspeare does—not as something fine in themselves, but merely as instruments of expression, and the simpler the better, so they be fitly chosen,—and who chooses them like Shakspeare? Words! Wonderful things are words—half spirit, half sense, so flexible, so various in their power! The poet can body forth to the fancy or to the imaginative faculty in words almost every thing the sculptor or the painter can in form and color, and a great deal that form and color cannot embody. What painter could give adequate form to the picture that Shakspeare in these words puts before the mind's eye."—*Ib. pp.* 110, 111.

Of the Infinite Artist he says, very beautifully—even admirably—

"His creative work is indeed the reflection of Himself—revealing in countless myriads of finite forms His mind and heart—the highest product of His creative love being spiritual free creatures, the image of Himself, capable in their measure of conceiving in thought and of realizing in free will the ideas of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, of which He is the infinite substance and cause—a kingdom of which He is the Father and Lord, in which He dwells and over which

der, that indwelling and providence being also a part of His artistic
The universe is God's grand Drama, of which He is at once Poet and
;—Infinitude the theatre; Eternity the time of action; the Conflict of
d Evil the secret of the plot and progress of the play; the Triumph of
final end:—a Drama eternally unfolding in His eye—the stage, the
the situations all arranged, and the actors called forth in their turn and
Him. The kingdom of Nature—all its creatures and powers are the
ous and passive instruments of His will; but in the kingdom of Spirits,
tures have the high function and sacred obligation of freely concurring
design, and working for Him and with Him for the accomplishment of
end. You and I and all spiritual creatures have our several parts, and
ell the part allotted to us, with a free and willing mind, is at once our
nd our end, our goodness and our blessedness; and so only can we be-
rticipant of the Eternal Life of the Living God."—*Ib.*, *pp.* 131, 132.

puts, in a good useful way, the distinction between inno-
nd virtue, on p. 139, (though we hope that our friend,
Oldham, does not encourage young daughters, in real
talking as the young lady talks in this part of his text.)
at he says of the seraphic knife-grinder, is very good:

ink you too with what joyous alacrity the cherubim would grind knives
e streets of our town, if set to do it by their Lord and ours; and how
would grind them too! And not a single seraph, winged by on swift
pon some embassy of highest import to the realm-ruling angel, would
hought of scorn for the faithful knife-grinder's, or the cheerful street-
's place and work.—*Ib.*, *pp.* 146, 147.

t is a nice little touch about the felicity and good fortune
men who honestly always go along with the world, (on
2, 153.)

y good stuff is that (not new but) hearty and wholesome
over what ought to be said till there are no tongues to
bout quiet, respectable piety, (on pp. 172, 173.)

ut the election of Judges and Universal Suffrage, the
tions taken, the points made, the reasons given, (from
to p. 208,) are all admirable, and we should like to quote
e part, to show the sharpness and clearness of our Au-
thought, but must send the reader to the book.

'*A gentleman*,' there is much discriminating and delicate
ciation and beautiful thought. Let it be always borne in
that, not less in our vulgarizing society than elsewhere,
gentle blood of some generations is generally necessary to

the gentleman: that an improved stock begets an improved stock: then let it be remembered that there are exceptions on both sides of this; and then let whoever will undertake to increase, by teaching, the numbers of American gentlemen.

Now, as there are some readers of this Review, as of other Reviews, that will incline to think us 'nothing, if not critical,' we must find some faults; but, if we do, we must go gingerly about it, knowing that there are some very homely, and even stupid tastes, which, as they cannot be made nice and delicate, so they ought not to be turned against the harmless things for which they hanker, and that satisfy them. An excellent man once gave his opinion that the Hymns in our Collection were not of equal merit, and at the same time confessed, that being fond of poetry, he was a little exacting. "Yes," answered the person to whom he was speaking, "there's that thing beginning 'How firm a foundation,' &c., with two lines somewhere in it,

> 'That soul, though all Hell should endeavor to take,' (or 'shake,')
> 'He'll never,—no, never!—no, never! forsake.'—

"Yes," said the excellent man and exacting critic, at this point, "that's grand!" Ought not an appreciation of that kind to be handled tenderly?—Not long after, the excellent man's interlocutor began to tell this story to a lecturer on 'Poets and Poetry,' and as he repeated the two lines above quoted, was cut off from the expression of an opinion by the enthusiastic suffrage, "Isn't that glorious?"

If our Author (particularly in the earlier part of his book) condescends to common and almost trite subjects and expressions, may we not suppose it to be from a reverent desire to accommodate himself to some classes of minds, that he wishes to carry along with him?

He has sometimes, (very seldom,) in writing fast, allowed himself in a construction of sentence which, though it has been growing common, is extremely vicious: as for example, where we happen to have the book open, on p. 307, 'Look at Falstaff—the perfect incarnation of a base soul—not the least sense of honor.' That is not quite an English sentence; as on

e next page, 308, this is not one: 'And so lost to shame at he faces the Prince with his lie, though he knew the Prince lieved him not.' Our Author does this thing accidentally; r he knows and makes good use of our noble mother tongue. Beginning independent sentences with the conjunction 'And,' ough the little word have a capital A, is not good prosody or ntax; nor is it good grammar, though common, to build up ntences without verbs. Yet this is American, scarcely cari-tured. 'He prances. Upon the green-sward. A horse. our-legged. Mane, flying! Tail, on the wind!' Our Au-or writes good English, as we say, again, in taking leave f him. Above all, and beside all individual excellencies, the eneral and predominant influence of this book is excellent: s readers are likely to be made not only more kindly by the ading, but larger-minded, and (better yet) of *larger heart.*

Here, then, as at the outset, we congratulate good readers pon the pleasure and profit that they will find in "Doctor Old-am at Greystones," and hope that we shall all, ere long, hear om him again.

The book is printed almost as handsomely as it deserves.

Art. III.—THE CHURCH AND THE DENOMINATIONS.

1. *The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.* By James Benign Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, &c. In two Vols. New York: John Doyle. 1842.
2. *The Causes and the Cure of Puseyism,* or the Elementary Principles of Roman Error detected in the Liturgy, Offices, Homilies and Usages of the Episcopal Churches in England and America; with a Proposed Remedy. By Ira Warren. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1847.
3. *Address on Ministerial Union.* By T. H. Stockton, Pastor of the Church of the New Testament. Philadelphia. 1859.

The Church is very small. Compared with the thousands of Christian men and women of various names in the land, her two hundred thousand communicants are but a handful. That truth is forced upon the attention of both her clergy and her laity, at times, in ways that are not at all pleasant, in ways too sometimes not at all flattering to their own consciences. And there is something imposing in mere numbers. We may as well confess it,—millions roll up grandly! A man can be very bold with millions on his side. And yet men have been bold with millions on the other side, "the number of the names together" on theirs being "about an hundred and twenty." Numbers are no test of either truth or might with a man who knows whence comes that quotation. The claims of the Church are not to be settled by the census now, more than in the days of Tiberius and Nero.

Nevertheless the condition of the Church as to numbers has its influence upon many good people within her. It has its influence upon those without her, as naturally we might expect. But there is no doubt that many a man who would have great faith in the Church, and very high notions of her claims and character if she counted her members by the million, has but very weak faith and very low notions since she only counts

hem by the thousands. That so small a body should put forth uch high claims, should bear itself so decidedly and confiently, to say the least, among the masses of earnest Christian nen and women in the land, whose earnestness and christianity *t certainly does not pretend to doubt*, seems to many without he body a great presumption; and to many within the body, hose views are perhaps not very clear, and whose faith in the ody is not very strong or well founded, a thing to be deprecaed, and if possible explained away. These good people are ndoubtedly very amiable, and their intentions are very good, ut still the distinctness of the Church's claims is not in the east weakened by their efforts. The vast body of Christians ithout, seeing daily the fact, that the Church recognizes the inisterial Commission of no denomination, but counts the ost distinguished D. D. among them a layman, in laying postolic hands upon him before she will admit him to her owest Order, seeing this so very often in these days, they canot be well argued out of their eyes; and the great mass of hose within, have their Prayer Books in their hands, and can ead the Preface to the Ordinal and understand it. Therefore he charge of "sectarianism," so easily made, will still pass mong our Christian brethren of other names instead of argunent, and will still save the trouble of examination and hought, and the same charge will still make many of our own umber very nervous, and set them to hunting up forgotten etters and pamphlets, to remove the charge by showing that divines of the English Church wrote to divines on the Continent sympathizing with them in their struggles against Popery; and that some of our own Fathers, in their early days, formed plans for the temporary government of the Church till it could get Bishops!—a line of argument which unfortunately proves nothing, and has the peculiar merit of having nothing to do with the question!

As this charge of "sectarianism" is so often made, however, and as it is often, say what we will, *honestly* made by many against the Church in their ignorance of her nature and the nature of "sectarianism," it should be met by her clergy and her defenders in a way which may shortly and conclusively

satisfy all *honest* men. That way is not surely by assuming that the torn and sundered state of Christianity which is about us now is the right state, and that we as Churchmen admit it to be right. The land is sick of it, and it will be hardly a satisfactory defence of the Church to show that she allows the right of everybody else to keep up divisions and only asks to be allowed the same right in turn. To remove the charge, we must show what the Church is, and what "Sectarianism" is, and to do that, we must, for the sake of those without and those within, go back to foundation-principles long forgotten or ignored. For the sake of those without and those within, we must patiently, and in love, go over and over again the examination of the grounds on which the Church stands. And that examination must often consist in a statement of the very plainest facts of our religion itself.

God made a Covenant with Adam. He made a Covenant with Noah. He made a Covenant with Abraham. He made anew that Covenant with Abraham's seed, by the hand of Moses. These Covenants are all spread open in the Old Testament. God deals with men there always in Covenant. The terms of these Covenants are on both parts distinct. The mutual pledges and conditions are very plain; they always, also, have visible signs and seals. God is dealing with *men*, not with angels or spirits, but with embodied, seeing, hearing, handling *men*; therefore, the Covenants are *signed* and *sealed*. God does not mistake the creatures of his own making. For embodied souls He has an embodied religion. The inward and spiritual clothes itself in the outward and visible.

Christ came—the Son to reveal the Father. The universal rule of the Old holds also for the New. True of the temporal, it is also true of the eternal—God is a Covenant-God. As He had dealt with men from the beginning, He deals with them still, and all the blessings brought to man in the last days by the Son are offered in Covenant; the salvation purchased by the birth, and life, and death, and resurrection and ascension, is given to men in Covenant. The New and eternal Covenant superseding, fulfilling, annulling all the Old, the perfect end, of

which they were but the hints, the feeble types, is now revealed and offered forevermore by the Eternal Son its Mediator.

The Covenant of Sonship, is it less distinct than the Covenant of Servitude? Is the Covenant of adoption any less a Covenant than the Covenant of works? Is there anything wanting to make the contract a real contract, the agreement a real agreement? Are not God's promises clear; are not men's duties clear? Is not the eternal Covenant a true thing, and no metaphor at all? Are not the mutual pledges clearly declared, and does not the contract distinctly bind the Son adopted in Christ, and the Father who adopts him? It is no metaphor; the New and better Covenant is a clear reality. The Lord Jesus died to make it so. A man can bind himself through the awful worthiness of that blood to God; can bind, the thought makes a man hold his breath, can bind God to him!

And how else can he hope? The great deeps sink below, the great heights are piled above, the unmeasured infinites swim away on all sides around him. He is blinded, stunned, beaten back, turn where he will. The trembling atom of an hour, he lives his little space, and does his little works, better or worse, lost from all but omnipotent sight in the vast heart of the encircling suns. The great systems roll, the pendulums of eternity they sweep through the trackless spaces, ticking ages as they go; the roar of the great flaming wheels of God's creation swells and deepens to His Central Throne, and I, and even this poor world and all it holds, are motes in the sea of being that heaves its billows on beyond the farthest stars. Standing here with all the fears and hopes that battle in a human heart, where can I look for confidence? Through all the piled eternities that wrap me round, and swallow me from sight and hearing, where shall be my trust? I am bound to God! God is bound to me! there is the only rock of assurance. The Covenant is real, the contract is signed, sealed; I hold the Almighty God, Who guides all these worlds by His pledged word, by His awful Oath of Truth that cannot fail. Through all the infinites the great Hand reaches down and grasps mine in the Covenant. I can *feel* the grasp, daily, nightly. The

"earnest" is given, the indwelling of the Spirit, and I am bound in living bands, mote of an hour, atom of a day, bound to the everlasting God! I shall live when all these suns are dead; I shall stand when all this space they lighten is rolled together as a scroll; for the God "who keepeth Covenant and promise," is pledged by his own changeless word *to me!*

Even so. The salvation purchased by the Saviour, all the benefits in body, soul and spirit, bought by His merits, are offered and conferred by express agreement. The terms are distinct on the part of man, the promises distinct on the part of God. Like all the Covenants past, it has, too, its Visible Signs and Seals. It is offered in the name of Christ, Whose blood purchases all human souls for Himself, to all men forever. By the terms of this Covenant, they become through the Eternal Son, the adopted sons of the Eternal Father.

This Covenant the Church administers. The Church was established for that express purpose, to offer this Covenant, to make known its terms, to enroll men under it, to administer it to the end. It is the House and Family of God, the corporate body whose members are under pledges to their Father, their Redeemer, their Sanctifier.

The Church does not make the terms on either side. It is no part of her duty, it is not in her power or right to decide the mutual obligations; the one sole Mediator did that, once for all. He promised in the name of God, He determined the conditions on which those blessed promises could be forever realized by man. And having marked distinct the terms of this eternal world-wide New Covenant, He committed it to the hands of authorized men to offer it to men so marked and so decided while the world lasts. The office of the Church is clear. Pardon, Justification, Eternal Life she is to offer in the name of Christ, on certain conditions, by Christ Himself established. The conditions are not hers, she is not acting for herself. She acts in her administration in the name and by the authority of another, and can go no word beyond the plain terms in her hands. Faithfully must she demand those, and, when complied with, in God's name, she must affix His own appointed seals.

We have said the terms were clear. They stand broadly written on the Record. About them there can be no confusion. The Pentecostal Church administered the Covenant the Church administers to-day—the changeless everlasting Covenant. A term invented since is no part of Christ's Gospel. A test established later, is a human and presumptuous test. The conditions on which God through Christ took home an alien and a prodigal on His own pledge of Fatherhood when St. Peter preached in Jerusalem, are the conditions on which men are saved to this hour,—the only and the sole conditions to whose fulfillment one promise of our God stands annexed. These conditions are Repentance, Faith in the Lord Jesus, and Obedience to the Law of love. The Apostolic Church set forth clearly those terms,—we have them again and again recorded,—and, on a profession of Repentance and Faith, enrolled men everywhere in the ranks of the redeemed, and in the name of God affixed visibly before men's eyes the seals of His own appointment, confirming His unfailing promise. There is no confusion, no doubt, not a moment's hesitancy. "What shall I do to be saved?" is answered boldly and distinctly in the moment of its utterance; "God will save you by the blood of Jesus on such terms. Here are the terms: Repentance, Faith, Obedience,—Arise and be baptized!"

All this seems clear enough, and yet just here begins all our confusion. Has any part of the Church, has the whole Church, has any number of men, have all men together, power or right to take from, or add to, or modify, the clear terms of God's Covenant? Understanding the nature of that Covenant, can any man hesitate on the answer? Demand one solitary condition more than Christ has expressly established, and it is your Covenant, not His. Demand one less, and it is yours, not His. Modify the Covenant terms in any way, and it is a human Covenant thenceforth. There is no power on earth to change the Testament left by the Divine Testator. The Church does not possess it, in all her Orders and Councils combined. She has received it to keep perfect to the last letter, and it is hers only to administer it to the very letter as it was given.

On that ground clearly the Church of England took her position at the Reformation. However it may have been with others, with her the ground of protest was, that the Pope of Rome had tampered with the terms of the Christian Covenant. She took her stand on facts. She rejected errors as simply additions to the original Faith. She appealed, not to private opinion on the Scripture, but to the simple Record of the facts in the case. She distinctly declared that she would, as an independent National Church, administer the Covenant of Christ on the original Apostolic terms, and would have nothing to do with a test made later. And, to-day, she occupies the same ground as a Protesting Church, the clear ground that as a matter of fact, the Pope of Rome and his servants do not administer the Covenant as committed to the Church; that he has, of his own mere will, at various times added conditions which are all merely human and presumptuous; many which are degrading to the human conscience, and impious towards God; conditions, which it is the duty of every Church to spurn for their arrogance, and witness against with all her voices, for their utter falsity and impiety; conditions, which made by all Popes, that have ever lived, in Council, every Christian man should, before his own conscience, and his God, to the last gasp, refuse as a denial of the One Mediator, as false to the One Only Head of the Church, his risen Master and Lord! Our American Church is certainly no whit behind her venerated Mother in the clearness and emphasis of *her* Protest.

But it is a peculiarity of action on defined principle, that in the change of circumstances, it may *seem* to change its relations. It is of course the circumstances that change, but shallow-thoughted people are very apt to think the principle is changed. My principles, to-day, may lead me to commend a man and take sides with him; to morrow he has been led into a new course, and I, acting on the same principle, am opposed to him. Shallow men may think I have changed. The man who looks below the surface, sees that the other has changed and I stand where I did. It has been so with the Church, in taking three hundred years her stand on this principle. To

Churches reforming with her, she was a fellow worker. To the same Churches afterward, altering, or adding to, or taking from the Faith, she, standing on principle, was as diametrically opposed as to Rome, and for just the same reason. Her principle is as strong against self-will among Protestants, as against self-will in the Pope. She denies the right of a Protestant "Assembly" to make new tests of Christianity, as emphatically as the right of Romish "Councils." She denies, just as decidedly, the right to make "Belief in Final Perseverance" a test, as she does the right to make belief in "Purgatory" a test; just as firmly does she refuse to admit the belief in "sensible conversion," as the belief in the "Immaculate Conception;" and, though so many have forgotten it, on just the same grounds. She is Protestant against each, because each is an addition to the authorized terms; each is imposed by mere human self-will. One Pope imposes the demand in one case, a hundred Popes do in the other, but the pure *popery* is the same in both; the spirit that attempts to offer and seal God's salvation, not on the terms of God, but on conditions by itself set up, because it thinks they ought to be; which dares to make its dogmatic or speculative decisions the measure of God's mercy or the touchstone of man's truth. Against Rome her ground taken at the Reformation is very clear. It was not taken then as against many forms of Protestant self-will, simply *because they did not exist.* But taken against one form of change, it was virtually taken against all; and the Church distinctly declares that the terms of the Covenant as required by the Apostles, are the sole terms, till the last candidate kneels at the Font, till the last head bows at the Altar!

And, as a fact, does not the Church administer the Christian Covenant on those ancient terms? Does she not require for admission to her fold, Repentance and Faith—Faith as expressed in the Apostolic Formulas, the Creeds of fact, as old as Christianity, and in nothing else? Creeds, which all profess to admit, as well as she, who can at all challenge the Christian name? Has she, in the slightest, changed the terms as the Church received them? Has she added anything? Has she taken anything away? Is there any pretence that she

has? Coming to her doors to-day, will not a man be admitted on the express conditions on which, according to the Record, St. Peter and St. Paul would have admitted him? Our Christian brethren speak of our "distinctive principles," as though we had, like others, made certain superfluous demands, on which we separate from them, as they do from each other; do we demand faith in the "Apostolic succession," before a man can be received? Do we, in administering the seals of the Covenant, make the belief in the "three Orders," and in the use of a Liturgy, a test to try him? Our requirements are honestly written and printed, and in the hands of all men—Prayer-books are very cheap—and are they any less or more than the requirements written in "The Acts of the Apostles?" And, as a fact, will any other body in the land admit a man to Covenant on those sole requirements? There are bodies calling themselves "Churches," in scores, who will not admit me to their communion on the very terms on which the Apostles of Our Lord would have admitted me to theirs! I must comply with this requirement. I must be able clearly to pronounce this shibboleth. I must be able to satisfy this test. Whether these are right or wrong, true or false, is not the question. They are tests of man's making; pet notions, which men in self-will have determined to try me by; because, though the Apostles did not require them, yet they think they ought to have done it—would do it, if they were now under a "developed" Christianity. I must submit or be turned away. One body will make me accept the "Westminster Confession." Another requires me to profess my faith in the "Immaculate Conception." One makes me declare "I believe in" my own "assurance of salvation;" another, will have nothing to do with me unless I aver it as my faith, that 'baptizo' means *dip!* One, wants to have my views on "slavery;" another, my opinions on a "Prohibitory Liquor Law." One, insists on my "sensible conversion;" another, on my confession of the "infallibility" of poor Pio Nono! I come to these bodies. I profess my sincere repentance, and desire to lead a new life. I confess my Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in the Baptismal Formula of the Oldest Church. I am bidden to depart! St. Paul would

have admitted me. St. Peter would have sealed me with the seal of the Covenant. I am turned away by the Protestant Preacher, for he has made new terms, in "Synod," and "Assembly," and "Conference;" and I am turned away by the Papist Priest, for his master, over in Italy, has taken it upon him to amend the Covenant made by Christ, and opens the Church's gates and, as he declares, the gates of Heaven, not to Christ's freemen, but to his own slaves. As regards these various bodies, that is just the fact. They are separate from us, not because they hold the Church has changed any term of the Covenant, but because she will not add other terms, which they have taken upon themselves to make. And that, before the Protestant Denominations, and before the Romish Apostacy, is her clear position; that she denies the power to add any term to the express terms of the Apostles. She does not, that is to say, stand on one ground against Rome, and on another against Protestant error. She stands on the same ground towards both. She is a Protestant against both equally. The additions of Rome are blasphemous in many cases, superstitious in others, degrading to Christian freedom and subversive of the Christian Faith in all; and the "Distinctive Principles" of some Protestant bodies may be harmless enough; may be even right and proper, as opinions; but the clear ground of vantage for the Church in this land is, that she is a living protest against them, first of all, because they are *human*, as terms of the Christian Covenant.

Now it would seem that this position taken by the Church, when she cleared herself of all novelties at the Reformation, might be plain enough for all her members, at least. But the influence of relative numbers is upon them, and they are frightened by the easy cries of "sectarianism," "bigotry," "arrogance," "unchurching," etc., coming from good Christian men, whom they with good reason honor for zeal and good works, but who are misled in the mazes of our endless divisions. They therefore attempt to convince these excellent people that they are mistaken, sometimes by meeting the Clergy of other bodies on platforms, sometimes by joining them in "Union Prayer Meetings," sometimes by declaiming, like one of themselves,

very earnestly against the "illiberality" of their brethren. The position of the Church is quite as much mistaken by them as by those good people without. Whom does *she* "unchurch?" What single human test has *she* made? Before the conscience of any Christian man in the land, where is the change she has made in the matter or the form of administering God's Covenant?—Bodies about her have. They have founded their existence on this new term, or that. They take their names, often, from their own invention of this kind. New bodies are doing the same thing yearly. The Church stands where she stood three hundred years ago; where she stood at the beginning. *They unchurch her*, and then exclaim against her "bigotry," because she will not acknowledge their right. Why, one body would not admit her greyest Bishop to lay-membership, without "dipping" him; and yet we hear about "unchurching!" Another would not admit the oldest communicant at her altars, without examining him on his faith in "Final Perseverance," and yet we hear complaints of "intolerance!" Another would demand of the very Simeons and Annas in her temples, before calling them Christians, that they should satisfy a "bench of Elders" of their right to the name, by passing their ten year old tests on matters of entire "Christian liberty!" And yet the Church is to blame for all this! And weak brethren think they must excuse her! She denies her own right to establish new tests, yet she is very "illiberal" not to admit theirs! She has stood protesting, for three hundred years, against the right of the Church of Rome to tamper with the Apostolic requirements, a Church *historically* as old as Christianity, and she is very "intolerant" not to admit the right of some sect to do the same; some sect, perhaps historically as old as her youngest Deacon! and the way to defend her from the charge is, to show that she stultifies herself, and admits it perfectly proper for any set of men, yesterday organized, to do what she herself would on no consideration dare to do; the doing which she holds would forfeit her Apostolicity!

Of course, the answer is, that these peculiarities of the various Denominations are only matters of secondary importance. From all the bodies, at times, comes the same declaration.

› divisions among Christians are only on matters of prefer-
on matters not at all essential." But what has this to do
the position of the Church in reference to these bodies ?
is the very assertion we make. These differences are un-
rtant, they are utterly outside the essence of the Faith.
there is the "sectarianism" at once. If they were not
ferent, if they were claimed to be of the first importance,
ey were asserted to be *de fide*, as the originators of every
virtually have declared them, there were some defence.
whenever the members of the various Evangelical Denom-
ons are pressed with their divisions, with a sense of the
and bitterness, and curse, of a dissevered Christianity,
is their ready answer.—"After all, the matters of differ-
are unimportant—it is a mere affair of preference"—and
ind are they to the very nature of sectarianism, that they
k that answer sufficient !—"It is all right to rend Christ-
y, to make it a burning shame and disgrace before a scoff-
world; to make mock of Christ's own words, of Christ's
prayers, if we only do it for matters indifferent; if we only
t from preference for trifles !" Is that not the answer
a again and again by good Christian people ? declared
i pulpits ? printed in religious newspapers ? declaimed
wonderful show of liberality in "Union Meetings," when-
the evils of division are brought home to men's con-
ices ?—"Divide if you will, split into this sect, and the
r, only never dare to assert you do it on principle, and
i conscience; be very careful you assert you do it only on
s, and from mere whim." Is not the charge of sectari-
m, made against the Church, founded on the plain fact
she does claim to stand on principle ? If she will only
it that she is a separate organization merely on matters in-
rent, would not the sting be taken from the charge at
? Many within her certainly seem to think so.

he Church, however, is in no danger of annihilation from
charge. She has borne it for a long time now, and seems
ave thriven under it remarkably. She can very well afford
ait. None of her sons need be too nervously anxious to
nd her from the charge; certainly not in a way which she

utterly repudiates; certainly not by declaring she believes herself only a respectable sect, like the rest. The great body of Churchmen in this country would certainly protest against the notion, that they are so because they have a weakness—an *amiable* weakness, for surplices, bands, written prayers and Bishops. They will certainly have small opinion of a line of defense which makes them sectarians, and confesses them so in the very attempt to defend them. They are not Churchmen on preference, on matters of taste, on the "fancy" notion at all. They are Churchmen, because before God they must be Churchmen or liars to their own consciences. They accept their position consciously, the position of the Church, and never count the numbers that may be wrong, satisfied they themselves are right.

The conscience of Christians on this matter of division is utterly stultified. That is just the fact. That conscience must be enlightened. The curse of a divided Christianity, a divided Protestantism in this land is crowding home to the hearts of earnest, thoughtful men everywhere.—Witness the Article entitled "The Lord's Business," in a late popular collection of Essays, which will be read from Maine to Texas. But these men are immersed in a sectism that chokes and blinds them. They see the evil, but see not whence it comes, nor how it is to be mended. They fly to temporary expedients. They babble about the "trifling differences," the "real essential oneness," and all the rest of it; and somehow seem to think, if you can only show that Christians *split on nothing*, you have cleared them of the charge of schism. When therefore a body confesses, for instance, that it only makes the "lining" of a hymn by *couplets*, or by the single verse, a test, as the "Wesleyans" of England are doing at present, it must surely be no longer sectarian! The truth is, these people feel the crushing evil; they see the endless hair-splittings that originate new "Churches;" they see how each makes its self-willed tests, and yet they see how utterly indifferent, senseless and stupid often, these tests, that make a new Church, are; and they cry out against all this; they cry for help in this sore evil; they try to plan remedies, but in vain, for they all admit the principle, *that*

ccording to their will can make a "Covenant"—terms of h membership at their pleasure—and call that human n, *the Covenant of* God. We, as Churchmen, see that, ting that, you have yielded all; sectarianism is at once . We see, that that must be denied, plainly, flatly, ut- lenied, before any road is opened to the light.

see that, too, from our *position* as Churchmen. The h gives us that knowledge almost unconsciously from the f her own standing. But we must not be content with r holding it unconsciously. We must assert it again and —patiently, persistently, and in meekness. It is the sole ıe of the Church against the idle cries that often seem uble our own people so much. It is the clear defence, ıanly, honest defence. It will commend itself at last to htful minds, to earnest hearts. "The Church utterly ı her own power to add a letter to the original Covenant . She utterly denies that there is any power on earth to She appeals to the Record that *she* has not. There are ı of various kinds that have, that claim they have, that their existence on the fact they have; and make it their ction, their life, their ground of separation that they have; *nakes them sectarian.* They assert, when pressed, that peculiarities, that their self-willed tests are only trifling. uch the worse. They are sectarian in the mere madness f-pleasing then;—so much the worse a great deal. The :h cannot recognize their right to do this;—why, she flatly ı her own.—She dare not do it. To recognize their posi- ıs right, is to give up the Reformation, with all it cost f agony and blood. To recognize it right, is to destroy rotestantism. To recognize it right, is to confess *herself* :; is to be dishonored to the consciences she is to guide." ıe, this defence will be misunderstood often; it will be abused and misrepresented. The Church is used to that. an afford to wait. It will, notwithstanding, commend to honest men, who do not like to see a solemn question ered by a sophistry, and a crushing evil cloaked with a r sham. Protestantism is shivered. They see it. They re it. It is apostate Rome's boast and triumph. They

will not take it, earnest, honest minds will not, for a sufficien answer, to say,—"It is shivered for *notions* merely." The certainly will not take that plain truth as convincing proc that it is not shivered at all—that "really it is all one." A all events, the Church will lend herself to no such dishonest Her position is fixed. She does not stand on *notions*. He members would not stand apart from their Christian brethre a day, on fancies and preferences. They will not be represente as doing so. They will not be declared cut off by any act c self-will, by the indulgence of any pet taste, from the million of good Christian people about them; and they can only ask since those good people profess they do stand apart for mer unimportant notions, why they do not throw their *notions* t the winds? Since they claim they can unite, with no injury t conscience, in *one* "Union Meeting," why they do not unite *in te thousand?* Since they claim to sink their preferences—Baptist Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, for *one* day, and glor over it, why they do not sink them forever, so deep that n fathom line can reach them? And that question will be pu by more than Churchmen. Others are learning to form i daily. They are gradually seeing that these professions of th "unimportance of our differences," these "Union Meetings" fi effect, these "Mixed Societies, where men take part as Chri tians, not as members of any sect," are not what they fanc them, proofs of their "unity," but proofs of their blind cling ing to disunion; not evidences of their "liberality," but con fessions of their utter *sectarianism* at heart; their self-wille persistence in dividing Christians for matters they can laug at; for trifles they can fling behind them whenever the fanc takes them.

The clear position of the Church is telling steadily on a this. And the simple duty of her loyal children is, to mak that position better and more clearly known. It is their duty from their position, to bring to the consciences of these breth ren the truth they have forgotten, and tell them they have n right to divide for their "distinctive notions" at all; and sho them how, the louder they profess those notions "unimportant, the more they convict themselves of sectarianism, the oftene

they meet with "denominational peculiarities" forgotten on platform or in union meeting, the oftener do they declare before the eyes of all thoughtful men the folly and the wrong they commit by perpetuating their divisions. It is their duty, by standing on principle which they cannot yield, by utterly refusing to allow that principle to be anything like a matter of self-will, by standing on its distinctness, and asserting it, it is their duty to show to men in this land, bewildered in the mazes of sectarianism, the limits of human power in matters Divine, the limits of the Church's authority in matters of the Covenant of Christ committed to her; and, by keeping their own skirts clear, show them the weakness, the blindness and the folly of sectarian division *on no principle ;* of sectarian distinctions which can be worn or cast off at the whim of the wearer. It is certainly a direct lie to their place, a direct insult to their brethren, a delusion put on human consciences groping bewildered for light, to take any course of action which can lead men to infer that a Churchman can ever be aught but a Churchman; that he could for a day stand apart, unless on changeless principles, which for one hour he cannot ignore or forget. It is simple treason to the Church of God, to put himself on the footing of sectarianism, and confess that CHURCH by implication a SECT.

Art. IV.—ENGLISH REFORMATION: THE NAG'S-HEA STORY.

[CONCLUDED.]

We come now to the *Charge of discrepancy among t Records considered.*

On this, we first give the very open and manly views of t Roman Catholic, Courayer, in his own language :—

"The variations which we find among the several authors who have cited Registers, make up the third objection against them, which in my opinion is most apparent and the most reasonable. And this disagreement is very obvio for one says that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, John, Suffragan of Dover, (Bedford). Sutcliff joins to the three first, Suffragans. The author of the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, but one Suffragan with the three Bishops, who is Richard, (John,) Suffragan Bedford. Mason agrees with this latter, as to the number, only he calls Suffragan, John. In short the Record of the 6th of December, found in Ryn names seven to whom the mandate for consecration is addressed; that is to the Bishop Landaff, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, Richard, (John), Suffragan Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and the Bishop of Osory in Ireland. that we see five different accounts of the same fact, and what are we to bel amidst so much variety? and what greater proof of the forgery of a Rec than the contrariety which is found among those that cite it?

"This difficulty appears astonishing at first sight, but when the disagreem which at first seems considerable, is examined to the bottom, by degrees objection at the same time vanishes away, as you will soon perceive.

"The Queen's Letters Patent for the consecration of Parker must not, in first place, be received in a sense that bears variety. She addresses her lett to seven, but the same letters imply that four of that number is sufficient execute that commission. '*Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor restr eundem Matthaeum Parkerum, in Archiepiscopum praedictae, consecrare litis cum effectu.*' Now this is what agrees with Mason, the author of the 'Li of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' and with Butler, and with Bramhall, Bur Collier, and all other succeeding writers.

"If Sutcliff mentions two Suffragans, it is because he was deceived by Queen's Letters Patent, in which there are two actually named, and did observe that the Act inserted in the Registers mentions but one; and as Butler, who mentions another Suffragan, if it be not the fault of the transcri or the printer, it must proceed from his not consulting the Registers, and t he did cite them no otherwise than upon hearsay, or a bad memory.

"But what is here worth observing is, that those who have published Record, always agree together. Bramhall and Burnet published it ent Mason and Collier have either quoted large fragments out of it, or else the s

stance of it; and we find no disagreement in what they have published. The variations, therefore, in question not proceeding from the *act* itself, they ought not to be produced as proof of its being a forgery.

Before this Record was made public, there is reason to believe that it was cited only upon unfaithful reports, or bad memories. Now would it not be surprising, if such cases were always exact? And should a man so rashly condemn a Record of inconsistency, whose substance is so uniform? For we see all agree that the ordination was performed by Barlow, Scorey and Coverdale, and all, (except one who puts in two,) mention one Suffragan; and if they do not agree in the name, yet one may see the reason very clearly in the Queen's Letters, wherein he will find the name wrong. These differences do not prove that there were different Acts of this Consecration, but that the Act in the Register was not exactly transcribed by those who quoted it; and this is what we see daily instances of among those who cite manuscripts, whose citations are found defective by those who more attentively examine after them; because the former, either by reason of precipitation, forgetfulness, or inadvertency, did not always read or cite exactly.

"In short, the *Act* even now exists in the Registers without any change; it is more than an hundred years that it has been seen such as it subsists to this day. Those who have cited it wrong did it by hearsay. There is no difference but about the *fact*, which *fact* is only one name placed for another. Even the variety of these citations proves that there was neither collusion nor forgery, but that they did not think fit to conceal things in favor of their own party. All these circumstances together, show that the differences objected are insufficient to prove the Record in question a forgery, and that in spite of these disagreements, it supports its authority; nay more, there are authentic certificates, given by public officers, to attest that the Record is the same with that which is published."*

The whole of the discrepancy is in the matter of one christian name. The Queen's commission for Consecration is addressed to Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, John Scorey, Miles Coverdale, *Richard* Hodgkin, Suffragan of Bedford, &c. But the Records show *John* Hodgkin as one of the officiating Bishops. The name of *Richard* seems to have been in the commission by mistake of the Queen's Secretary; if, indeed, the error be not more recent. No Bishop answering to that name is known among the Bishops of that time. *John* Hodgkin is well known to have been at that time Suffragan of Bedford; and the fact of his answering to the

* Courayer's Defense of Anglican Ordinations. Chap. II, pp. 50–52. Oxford: 1844.

summons, and participating in the consecration of Parker, as shown by all the Records, is abundant proof, either that the original document was properly filled, or that it was regarded as merely a clerical blunder, and well understood. If it is apparent that he, (John Hodgkin,) did officiate on the occasion, the question, by what name he had been called in the summons, or whether called at all, would be wholly foreign to the question of validity, according to the showing of Romanists themselves. That John Hodgkin was a Bishop, no one has ever seriously questioned. According to the old Records he was consecrated on the 8th of December, 1537, by John Stokesley, Bishop of London, John Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, and Robert Wharton or Parfew, Bishop of St. Asaph.

Upon the whole, we think it must be apparent that this whole story about the discrepancy between the Commission and the Record is a matter of the very smallest importance, and does not, in the least, affect the main question at issue. There were three Bishops, without Hodgkin, any one of whom could have given a valid Consecration, as we shall hereafter see.

We shall close our examination of this point by inserting the testimony of one of the ablest scholars and historians of the Romish Church, viz.: the Rev. J. Lingard, D. D. So great was the esteem in which he was held as an historian, that he is reported to have been advised by the Romanists of England to decline a Cardinal's hat, that he might devote himself to the work of writing an History of England that should meet the views of the Romish Church. This important work, with many others of great value, he lived to complete.

In Vol. VII. Note J, American Edition, he writes thus:

"It may perhaps be expected that I should notice a story, which was once the subject of acrimonious controversy between the divines of the two communions. It was said that Kitchin and Scorey, with Parker and the other Bishops elect, met in a tavern called the Nag's head in Cheapside; that Kitchin, on account of a prohibition from Bonner, refused to consecrate them, and that Scorey, therefore, ordering them to kneel down, placed the Bible on the head of each, and told him to rise up Bishop. The facts that are really known are the following. The Queen, from the beginning of her reign, had designed Parker for the Archbishopric. After a long resistance, he gave his consent, and a *congé d'elire* was issued to the dean and chapter, July 18th, 1559. He was chosen August 1. On Sept. 9th, the Queen sent her mandate to Tunstal, Bishop of

Durham, Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pool, of Peterborough, Kitchin, of Landaff, Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, under Mary, and Scorey, of Chichester, also deprived under Mary, to confirm and consecrate the Archbishop elect. (Rym xv. 541.) Kitchin had conformed; and it was hoped that the other three, who had not been present in Parliament, might be induced to imitate his example. All three, however, refused to officiate; and in consequence, the oath of supremacy was tendered to them; (Rym. xv. 545,) and their refusal to take it was followed by deprivation. In these circumstances no consecration took place; but three months later, (Dec. 6,) the Queen sent a second mandate, directed to Kitchin, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, the deprived Bishop of Exeter, under Mary, John, Suffragan of Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, Bishop of Ossory; ordering them, or any four of them, to confirm or consecrate the Archbishop elect; but with an additional clause, by which she, of her supreme royal authority, supplied whatever deficiency there might be, according to the statutes of the realm, or the laws of the Church, either in the acts done by them, or in the person, state, or faculty of any of them; such being the necessity of the case, and the urgency of the time. (Rym. xv. 549.) Kitchin again appears to have declined the office. But Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale and Hodgkin, Suffragan of Bedford, confirmed the election on the 9th; and consecrated Parker on the 17th. The ceremony was performed, though with a little variation, according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. Two of the Consecrators, Barlow and Hodgkins, had been ordained Bishops, according to the Roman Pontifical: the other two according to the Reformed Ordinal. (Wilk. Conc. iv. 198.) Of this Consecration on the 17th of December, there can be no doubt; perhaps in the interval between the refusal of the Catholic prelates, and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag's head, which gave rise to the story."

A correspondent of the "Bermingham Catholic Magazine," having called on Dr. Lingard, through the pages of that periodical, for his proofs, the learned writer addressed the following letter to the Editor, some time in 1834.

Mr. Editor,—In your last number a correspondent, under the signature of T. H., has called on me to show why I have asserted (Hist. v. 155, Note H,) that the Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. Though I despair of satisfying the incredulity of one who can doubt after he has examined the documents to which I have referred, yet I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objection which can be brought against it.

I. The matter in dispute is, whether Parker received, or did not receive consecration on the 17th of December; but the following facts are, and must be admitted on both sides: 1st. That the Queen having given the royal assent to the election of Parker, by the Dean and chapter of Canterbury, sent on September 9, a mandate to six prelates to confirm and consecrate the Archbishop-elect, and that they demurred, excusing, as would appear from what followed, their disobedience by formal exceptions on points of law. 2d. That on the 6th December, she issued a second commission to seven Bishops, ordering them, or any four of them to perform that office, with the addition of a sanatory clause, in which she supplied, by her supreme authority, all legal or ecclesiastical defects on account of the urgency of the time, and the necessity of the things; "tem-

poris ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante," words which prove how much the Queen had this consecration at heart; and certainly not without reason, for at that time, with the exception of Landaff, there was not a diocese provided with a Bishop, nor, as the law then stood, could any such provision be made without a consecrated Archbishop, to confirm and consecrate the Bishops-elect. 3d. That four out of seven Bishops, named in the commission, (they had been deprived or disgraced under Queen Mary, but had now come forward to offer their services, and solicit preferment in the new Church,) having obtained a favorable opinion from six counsel learned in the law, undertook to execute the commission, and confirmed Parker's election on the 9th of December.

II. Now, these facts being indisputable, what, I ask, should prevent the Consecration from taking place? The Queen required it, Parker, as appears from his subsequent conduct, had no objection to the ceremony, and the commissioners were ready to perform it, or rather under an obligation to do so; for by the 25th of Henry VIII. revived in the last parliament, they were compelled, under the penalty of præmunire, to proceed to the Consecration within twenty days after the date of the commission. Most certainly all these preliminary facts lead to the presumption that the Consecration did actually take place about the time assigned to it, the 17th of December, a day falling within the limits I have just mentioned.

III. In the next place, I must solicit the attention of your readers to certain indisputable facts, subsequent to that period. These are—1st. That on the 18th (and the date is remarkable) the Queen sent to Parker no fewer than six writs addressed to him, under the new style of Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate and metropolitan of all England, and directing him to proceed to the Confirmation and Consecration of six Bishops elect for six different Sees. This was the first time, during the six months which had elapsed since his election, that any such writ had been directed to him. What, then, could have happened, just before the 18th, to entitle him to this new style, and to enable him to confirm and consecrate Bishops, which he could not do before? The obvious answer is, that he himself had been consecrated on the 17th. 2nd. That on the 21st, he consecrated four new Bishops, on the 21st of January five others, two more on the 2d, and two on the 24th of March. Can we suppose that so much importance would be attached to Consecration given by him if he had received no Consecration himself? or, that the new Church would have been left so long without Bishops at all, if it had not been thought necessary that he, who was by law to consecrate the others, should previously receive that rite? 3d. That afterward, at the same time with the new prelates, he obtained the restoration of his temporalities, a restoration which was never made till after Consecration. 4th. That he not only presided at the convocation, but sat in successive parliaments, which privilege was never allowed to any but consecrated Bishops. In my judgment, the comparison of these facts with those that preceded the 17th of December, forms so strong a case, that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favor of the Consecration, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished.

IV. But there exists such evidence in abundance. That Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December is asserted, 1st by Camden, (i. 49,) 2nd, by Godwin, (De Præs. p. 219,) 3d, by the Archbishop himself in his work, De Antiqui-

tate Britanicæ Ecclesiæ, published in 1572, three years before his death, or if that book be denied to be his, in his diary, in which occurs the following entry in his own hand, "17th Dec. Ann. 1559 consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem. Heu! Heu! Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me! (Strype's Parker, App. 15). And 4th, by the Archiepiscopal Register, a record which details the whole proceeding, with the names of the Bishops, of their chaplains, and of the official witnesses. In truth it descends to so many minute particulars, that I think, Mr. Editor, it must be the model after which are composed the descriptions of Consecrations, ordinations and dedications, which we have the pleasure of perusing in your pages. In one respect only must it yield the superiority to them. It names not either the organists or the singers.

V. Now to this mass of evidence, direct and indirect, what does your correspondent oppose? That Harding and Stapleton, and the more ancient Catholic controvertists, denied that Parker was a Bishop. That is indeed true: but I always understood that their objections (which is certainly the case with respect to the two passages quoted in your last number,) referred to validity, not to the fact of his Consecration; and if Dr. Milner has chanced to assert the contrary, I fear that he wrote it hastily, and without consideration. I am not aware of any open denial of the facts till about fifty years afterward, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag's Head was published. In refutation of that story, Protestant writers appealed to the Register; their opponents disputed its authority, and the consequence was, that in 1614, Archbishop Abbot invited Colleton the Arch-priest, with two or three other Catholic missionaries, to Lambeth, and submitted the Register to their inspection in the presence of six of his own Episcopal colleagues. The details may be seen in Dodd, ii. 277, or in Godwin, p. 219.

VI. Your correspondent assures us that the Register contains "so many inaccuracies and points at variance with the history of the times, as manifestly prove it a forgery." Were it so, there still remains sufficient evidence of the fact. But what induces T. H. to make this assertion? Has he examined into all the circumstances of the case? or does he only take for granted the validity of the several objections which are founded on misconception or ignorance; that the Register agrees in every particular with what we know of the history of the times; and there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery.

VII. Your readers will observe, that in this communication I have confined myself to the fact of Parker's Consecration; whether it was valid or invalid, according to Catholic doctrine, is a theological question, with which, as a mere writer of history, I had no concern."

JOHN LINGARD.

The next point of our examination is, *Was William Barlow ever consecrated to the Office of Bishop?*

Driven from every point of attack on the direct question of Parker's Consecration, Romanists have fallen back and rallied on the question whether *William Barlow*, the presiding Bishop

at the Consecration of Parker, was ever himself consecrated! The proof of this is really unnecessary to the establishment of the *validity* of the Consecration, provided there be evidence of the other three, or any *one* of them, being a Bishop. For it has never been questioned that *one* Bishop was capable of consecrating another, or others; nor that such Consecration possessed all the essential elements of validity; though from very early times they have been uncanonical, and the Consecrators liable to censure. The commission has ever been regarded as coming from the Consecrating Bishop; the one who delivers to the candidate the Holy Scriptures, imposes hands, and uses the prescribed Form of words. All the Bishops present, or at least three, are required, by canon, to unite in the imposition of hands; but ordinarily, the presiding Bishop alone delivers the Scriptures, and pronounces the consecrating words; hence he is appropriately called the "Consecrating Bishop." In this case, it is granted that the validity of the Consecration must depend on the Consecrating Bishop. In the Consecration of Parker, however, we find a departure from the general usage, which happily settles all question as to the validity of his Orders, even though the previous Consecration of any one, or even *three*, of the officiating Bishops should be questioned. This has been happily noted in the works of Archbishop Bramhall:—

"It appears by the Register that Barlow presided at Parker's Consecration i. e., Parker was presented to him by the other Bishops, and the usual interrogations were addressed to Parker by him, while all the four Bishops together joined in the imposition of hands, in the use of the form of words, and in the delivery of the Bible; i. e., in the Consecration itself. The position occupied by Barlow, therefore, does not answer to that of the Consecrating Bishop, (as it is termed,) who was usually either the metropolitan himself, or one commissioned by him; for the latter, (according to the canon of the fourth council of Carthage, and according to our Ordinal, both King Edward's and the present form,) pronounces the words of Consecration alone, the assistant Bishops joining in the imposition of hands. (in the words, however, also, according to the Roman Ordinal, although in a lower tone,) whereas, here in consecrating the metropolitan himself, all joined throughout, and equally. It follows, then, upon every theory that the absence of Barlow's Consecration, if it were so, would not invalidate that of Parker."*

* Bramhall's Works, new edition, Vol. III, p. 136, Note 7.

The reason of all the Bishops performing the same part in the Consecration of Parker was, that neither one of them was a metropolitan, nor named by a metropolitan as Consecrator. In view of their official parity, it was deemed proper that all should perform the same part, in what constituted the essence of Consecration. This was unusual, but has never been urged as an objection to the Consecration, even by Romanists, and as the present question has been raised, it is fortunate.

With these preliminaries we come to the question of Barlow's Consecration. It has been denied by Romanists. The reasons assigned are, 1st. "Cranmer's Register, which contains the Consecrations performed by that prelate, or by his order, makes no mention of the Consecration of Barlow." 2nd. "In Rymer's collection there appears a Commission of the Queen, addressed to Parker, to confirm and consecrate Barlow, Bishop of Chichester." The question very naturally arises, if Barlow had been consecrated Bishop previous to Parker's Consecration, why should Parker afterward be commissioned to consecrate him? 3rd. "Bonner, Romish Bishop of London, threatened Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Landaff, with excommunication, in case he should assist in the Consecration of Parker; but sent no such threat to Barlow, which he would certainly have done had he regarded him as a Bishop."

1st. It is generally admitted that Cranmer's Register does not take notice of Barlow's Consecration. This, however, is but negative testimony, and, in the absence of anything positive on either side, can do nothing more than raise a doubt. But although Cranmer's Register be silent on it, we have much positive testimony. Among the writings of Wharton, author of *Anglia Sacra*, we find the following: "William Barlow, at that time Prior of the Canons Regular of Bisham, of the Order of St. Augustine, was elected Bishop by the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, in the year 1536, January the 16th. On the 23rd of February he was confirmed by Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury."

The author of the *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, says, "William Barlow, S. T. P., was elected January 16, 1535, confirmed February 23 following, &c." The difference of O. S. and N. S.

is observable in the two writers; with this observation it is apparent that they perfectly harmonize. Barlow was elected January 16, 1535–6, and confirmed on the 23rd of February following. Many writers testify to the same effect. Of this there is no question, and all that is wanting is a positive record of his Consecration. Now let it be borne in mind that his confirmation could not have taken place but for the writ of the Crown; and that this writ, or mandate, invariably required not only the confirmation, but the Consecration, to take place within twenty days from the date thereof, on pain of *præmunire*; which was nothing short of complete ruin to the metropolitan, by Act 25 of Henry VIII. Rymer assures us that the writ for confirmation and Consecration was addressed by the King, Henry VIII., to the metropolitan, Cranmer, on the 22nd of February, and that the confirmation took place on the day following; and as no censure was ever passed on Cranmer for neglect of duty, and Barlow is found, soon after, in the performance of his Episcopal function, there is the strongest presumptive evidence of his Consecration.

We know it is sometimes urged by Romanists, that the Protestants became very loose in their notions of the importance of Consecration, and of all ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies. This may have been the case with some of them, at a later period, but let it be observed this was in 1536, while Henry VIII. was yet on the throne; who never, to the day of his death, entertained any other than Romish notions, save in the matter of the papal jurisdiction. The only change which he ever made, was to strike out of the Ordinal the Oath of allegiance to the Pope. During his life, the idea of dispensing with Consecration in a Bishop could not have been tolerated.

As for the omission in Cranmer's Register, it proves nothing, even were there no positive or presumptive evidence against it. It is well known that the Records of those times were not kept with very great care. Francis Mason, in his Defense of the Ministry of the Church, declares that there are a great many other Consecrations about that time, which have been omitted, and yet have never been questioned. Among them he mentions those of Gardiner, Fox and King, neither one of which

appears in the Register; but no Romanist has ever been found to question the fact of their Consecration. Another writer of note, after examining the Register with much care, says, "The Consecration of Barlow is not to be found in Cranmer's Register, no more are those of several other Bishops, whose ordinations have hitherto been never disputed by any body; such as Fox, Bishop of Hereford, Sampson of Chichester, Bell of Worcester, Day of Chichester, whose Consecrations are entirely omitted. What shall I say of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Latimer of Worcester, White of Lincoln, Bayne of Litchfield, Tuberville of Exeter, Hopton of Norwich, Goldwell of St. Asaph; whose confirmations and Consecrations, if I am not very much mistaken, are not to be found now in the Archiepiscopal Registers."

Another proof of Barlow's Consecration, by no means unimportant, is in the fact that from about the time of his well attested confirmation, or soon after, he regularly occupied his seat in the House of Lords. But it is well known, that membership in the House of Lords had never been granted since 1327, on the accession of Edward III., to any Bishop elect, but only on presentation of the King's Writ, in virtue of which he was put in possession of his temporalities; and this instrument could be obtained, only on his presenting to the King a certificate of Consecration. This was matter of law, or at least of fixed custom, from which the Parliament never departed. But in all the Convocations and sessions of Parliament under Henry VIII., from 1536, Barlow was always summoned with the other peers of the realm, and took his seat with them; not as a "Guardian of the Spiritualities," nor as Bishop elect, nor Bishop confirmed, but as *Bishop;* and "even to place of other Bishops, whose consecrations were never questioned." So it appears on the Records of the House of Lords. Moreover, it is well known that in the time of Henry VIII. Barlow was called upon to assist in the Consecration of other Bishops. According to Cranmer's Register, he assisted by order of the Crown, in the Consecration of Arthur Buckley, Bishop of Bangor, on the 19th of February, 1542.

Another proof of his being regarded as a true Bishop,—Bishop of Bath,—comes from a source which should certainly be credible among Romanists. When Queen Mary came to the Crown in 1553–4, it is known that many of the Protestant Bishops, from fear of persecution, deserted their posts, and went to the Continent for protection; among these was Barlow. These were all construed into resignations, and most of the places filled by Romish Bishops. The commission drawn up by the Chapter of Canterbury for the government of the Church of Bath, during the vacancy of the See, declares it to be vacant "by the free and voluntary resignation of William Barlow, *the last Bishop and Pastor of that Church.*" This same clause is in the *Congé d' élire* directed to the Chapter of Bath by Queen Mary, bearing date March 13, 1554. So in the act of investiture assigned to his successor, the same words appear. Thus, the Romish Church, under Queen Mary, acknowledges him as a true Bishop, and proceeds to fill his place, only *because of his "free and voluntary resignation."* Moreover, a sentence was afterward passed upon him, depriving him of his Bishoprick.

Upon the whole, though the Register of Canterbury be at fault in the matter of Barlow's Consecration, the evidence is as clear of his being a regularly consecrated Bishop, as the most faithful historian could desire. It is not doubted that he was elected and confirmed Bishop of St. Asaph, in 1536, and immediately translated to St. David's. That he was translated thence to the See of Bath and Wells in 1548, and that he was exiled in 1553–4, on the accession of Mary; and that on the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, he was called to the See of Chichester, where he spent the remainder of his life. It is, moreover, true that a question of his Consecration was never raised until about the time of James I. in 1603, some seventy-five years after his Consecration, and long after his death. Hence we have no fear in committing the question to the intelligence of the Church and the world; not doubting the verdict that will be rendered in due time.

2nd. The second objection, that the King's mandate was issued for Parker to consecrate Barlow, soon after Barlow had

ssisted to consecrate him, (Parker,) needs but little attention. 'his is founded on Rymer's assertion, that it so appears in the tolls. If it were so, it would prove but little, seeing that it ras no uncommon thing in those times, for the mandate to rder the *Consecration* of a Bishop, when only his confirmation r institution as Bishop of a certain Diocese was meant, he aving been translated from one Diocese to another, and previously consecrated. Courayer enumerates not less than seven ases where the mandates, as they stand on the Rolls, order a *'onsecration*, where the evidence was clear of previous Consecration; and where nothing was meant but a *confirmation* of translation. On the other hand, he quotes five cases where he mandate ordered only the *confirmation* where Consecration ras intended, and the Register shows that it actually took lace.

But after this had been long discussed, it was agreed to have new examination of the Records in the Chapel at the Rolls, rhen the astounding truth was revealed that Rymer had misead the Record, and that the mandate only orders the confirmation and Institution of Barlow in his new Bishoprick of 'hichester. "I positively affirm," says the Clerk, "that there s no error in the royal mandate. The fault, be it what it will, ras altogether Rymer's; who, finding seven mandates together f the same tenor, did not accurately enough observe in what nanner five of them were expressed; namely, that the nomiated in them were both to be confirmed and consecrated; and hat the other two, (viz.: those that belonged to Barlow and Scorey,) required only that they should be confirmed." Thus, all the splendid logic predicated on this story falls to the ground; the fact on which it rests being proved entirely false.

3d. The third, and last objection,—that if Bonner had recognized Barlow as a Bishop, he would have threatened him, as he did Kitchin, in the case of the Nag's-head Consecration,—demands but little attention. In the first place, it is begging one of the main questions under consideration. It assumes the truth of the whole Nag's-head story—or at least the major part of it—which we have shown to be fabulous and false, throughout. But assuming it to be true, as we have previ-

ously intimated in the case of the Bishop of Landaff, so we still more strongly assert in the case of Barlow, it is little probable that a threat from Bonner, whom Barlow regarded as excommunicate, or even from the Pope himself, whose jurisdiction Barlow had long since ignored, should have cut any figure, or arrested the least attention. Whatever may have been the timidity of the old Bishop of Landaff, Barlow's course had long been determined; so that Bonner could not have entertained the idea of intimidating him by any threat of Papal vengeance. But until the Nag's-head fiction can be proved to possess a single word of truth, from first to last, it is utterly useless to argue any question arising out of it.

The question of Barlow's Consecration, though not essential, as we have shown, to that of Parker, we have now examined; and if, from the very nature of the question, the proof falls short of absolute demonstration, yet, we flatter ourselves that the array of facts is such as, to all thinking minds, to render it morally certain that Barlow, one of the Consecrators of Parker, had been regularly consecrated to the Office of Bishop. On this point we quote again the language of the Romish historian, Lingard. He says:

"When, therefore, we find Barlow, during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with the other Consecrated Bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a Consecrated Bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his Seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the Episcopal body."—*Lingard's History, &c. Boston*, 1851. vol. vii., p. 338.

Let it be remembered that this is Lingard's language, in his latest revised edition, which he completed just before his death, in 1851. So far from retracting his previously expressed opinion as to what he himself stigmatized the "Nag's-head fable," he fortified that opinion by unanswerable facts and arguments, which are enough to shame our modern assailants into silence.

We come next to the question, *Was there any essential defect in the matter or form of Parker's Consecration?* This is the only other objection, of any importance, urged by Roman-

ists to the Anglican Consecrations. It is alleged, that the Ordinal of Edward VI. used in the Consecration of Parker, and ever after, until the time of Charles II., and with slight modifications still retained in the English, Scotch, and American Churches, is defective in matter and form, and therefore incapable of conveying Holy Orders, however genuine may have been the Consecration of the Bishops using it. By *matter*, we are to understand that which is *done;* by *form*, that which is *said*, in the Service of Consecration, or Ordination.

It is readily granted that the Ordinal, together with the entire Liturgy, was revised in the time of Edward VI., both in respect of matter and form. This was done in accordance with a universal consent of all ages, fully expressed by the Romish Council of Trent, "that the Church always had a power of making such Constitutions and alterations, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, provided their substance was preserved, as it should judge, with regard to the variety of circumstances, times, and places, to be most expedient for the salvation of the receivers, or the veneration of the Sacraments, *themselves.*" We quote the language of the Council of Trent; and would call particular attention to the fact, that that body included Ordination, in all its grades, in the word *Sacrament;* that being held by the Romish Church as one of the Seven Sacraments.

In this, the Council spoke a well-known sentiment of the Church Catholic; and the English Church, in revising the Ordinal, acted on the same well-recognized principle. It is readily granted that where matter, or form, is prescribed in Holy Writ, the Church has no power to alter them. For instance; Christ has appointed Water, in Baptism; and no Ecclesiastical authority can substitute another element. So Christ hath ordained Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion; and the Church cannot dispense with nor provide a substitute for either. So He has appointed a *form* in Baptism—the name of the Blessed Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—and this, the whole Catholic Church, in solemn Council assembled, dares not and cannot change. But in the conferring of Holy Orders, the Word of God has prescribed no

form, nor given any direction, farther than we learn of the Apostolic "Laying on of hands." Hence, all matter, and form, beyond this, is purely conventional, or canonical. The learned Morinus, a Catholic canonist of great repute, declares that "The imposition of hands is the only essential *matter* of this Sacrament." Other matter has, indeed, been used, at different times; such as the *Unction*, the *Imposition of the Book of the Gospels*, and the *delivery of the keys*, and other instruments. These, we believe, are still used in the Romish Church; but that they are essential to the validity of Orders, cannot be shown, any more than that salt and honey are essential to the validity of Baptism. The Unction, it is well-known, is not, nor ever was, in use in the Greek Church. The Delivery of the Instruments, according to Morinus, Mabillon, and Martene, was scarcely known before the ninth century; and the Imposition of the Books, though more ancient, was certainly omitted by the Syrians and Maronites, and generally unknown in the earliest ages of the Church; Alcuin, a writer of great prominence in the eighth century, declares, "There is no authority to be produced for it, either ancient or new; nay, not so much as the tradition of the particular Church of Rome." "It gives us no scandal," says Fulbertus Carnot, Ep. 2, "to hear that there have always been different usages and customs, but the same common faith in the Churches of Christ." Nay, even L'Abbe Renaudot, a prominent champion of Romanism against the Anglican Consecrations, admits that there was no essential defect in Parker's Consecration with regard to the *matter;* and insists only on the defects of the *form*, which he declares was "unknown to all the Pontificals of the Christian world."

As to what constitutes the essential *form* of words, in Ordination, or Consecration, there has, we believe, never been anything like a general agreement. In most Churches, the laying on of hands has been preceded, and followed, by prayers. Also, in most of the Western Churches, it has been accompanied with, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c." "Take the Holy Ghost, &c." "But," says Morinus, "there are no Latin Rituals of any antiquity to be met with, that have these words in them; nor is there any mention made of them even in many of much later times. It is scarce four hundred years since

ey began to be used among the Latins; but as for the eeks and Syrians, they neither do at present, nor ever did, ake use of them; so that there is no reason for making them the substance of Ordination." Martene says, "These words, eceive thou the Holy Ghost, &c., are scarce to be met with in ıy pontifical that is four hundred years old."

With regard to the prayers used be'ore, and after, the lay-ıg on of hands, it is to be observed that those in the Syriac rdinals, are quite different from those of the Greek; and ıese, different from those of the Roman Churches; and even nong these, though we observe a greater degree of uniformity, here is much diversity. Fulbertus remarks, "In many par-.culars, Greece and Spain differ; the Churches, also, of Rome nd France differ from them; yet we receive no scandal from hence." In short, there is no reason to question that, as in the hole Liturgy, so in the Ordinal, there has been a general con-ent, from early times, that every Bishop should have liberty n matters of form; the essence, of course, being preserved. t is not a little remarkable that the Romish Church has ever pproved the orders of the Greek Church, and continues to do o to this day, notwithstanding the difference in their Ordinals.

One single objection of Archbishop Kenrick's, which he resses with great earnestness, we may notice in few words. Ie insists that there is nothing in the consecrating sentence to how whether the candidate is being admitted to the grade of Bishop, Priest, or Deacon.

It is readily granted that if a stranger were to enter the Church just at the moment when this sentence was uttered, having no acquaintance with Church usages, and should depart immediately on hearing that one sentence, he might be at a loss to determine its import. The same must be admitted of many parts of the Service of the Romish Church, and of every other Church. But to say that there is, in the Office for Consecrating Bishops, nothing to show whether they are created Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, is so utterly absurd, that we wonder any writer, however insignificant, should ever have ventured on the assertion. To say nothing of the presentation of the candidates, the questions asked, and the prayers used,

before and after Ordination, all of which clearly specify the Office, the ordaining sentences are different and distinctive. In short, it is impossible for even the most superficial observer to attend on any one of the Services, without receiving the clearest and most distinct idea of the Office conferred. But, not to waste time on this puerile objection, we simply refer to the fact already shown, that no form has been prescribed in Holy Writ, and that the Church Catholic has never fixed on any one; the customs being different in different countries, and no objection ever raised concerning the form, until since the English Reformation.

Thus, we have shown, in as few words as possible, that the only essential *matter* known to the Church Catholic, is "the laying on of hands;" and the only *form* generally approved, or deemed necessary, is in the words, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c., or, "Take the Holy Ghost, &c. That both this matter and form were used in Parker's Consecration cannot be questioned, if the Registers and authentic Records are to be believed. Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, writing on the authority of the Records, says; "after offering up several prayers and supplications to God, according to the form prescribed in the book of Common Prayer, established by Act of Parliament, the Bishops of Chichester and Hereford, the Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, laid their hands upon the Archbishop, and said, in English, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness." This is in perfect agreement with the Ordinal of Edward VI.

It is readily granted that there was no unction, nor the delivery of any instruments, nor the laying of the sacred books on the head, neck, or shoulders, of the candidate. The Sacred Scriptures were *presented* to him, according to the Ordinal, with the charge, "Give heed unto reading, &c." But this, according to the sense of the Church, of all ages, was not of the essence of Consecration. It is regarded as purely figurative; being admissible, in good taste, and well calculated to impress the candidate, and all present, with the truly ministerial character of the Office conferred; but not as being in any way

essential. Morinus, on the subject of the *imposition* of the Book of the Gospel, says, after speaking of the diversity of usage in this respect, "This variety shows us, as in a glass, what little stress is to be laid upon those arguments which many are influenced by, in asserting, or denying, the imposition of the Book of the Gospels to belong to the matter of Episcopal Ordination. For being, myself, determined by other reasons—by reasons derived from ecclesiastical tradition—I conclude that the imposition of the Gospels upon the neck and shoulders of the person Ordained, no ways affects the substance of Episcopal Ordination."

In short, the whole of this ado of Romanists about the insufficiency of the matter and form of Anglican Ordinations, is predicated on the assumption of what is neither self-evident, admitted, nor proved—that nothing can be approved of God which has not the endorsement of the Romish Church.

Art. V.—ROMISH PERVERTS: WHERE THEY C FROM?

The assertion is often made, first, that Rome has r large accessions from the ranks of the Clergy of the C and secondly, that all who have thus passed over to the er of Popery came from the ranks of those who are po termed "High Churchmen." These assertions are to made from sheer ignorance; but oftener they are made b Sects about us, who themselves have lost so many of the isters, to our gain; and by party men among ourselve lose no opportunity to express their sympathy with S and their dislike of positive and strongly defined Church

To sift this matter thoroughly, we have taken pains t out a complete Catalogue of all the Clergy of the C who, from the settlement of Jamestown in 1608, the beg of the American Church, have joined the Roman Schis to ascertain the antecedents and particularities of eacl *vidual* case. It has been found, that not one apostat Papacy until the year 1815; that, out of a body of mo five thousand Clergy, only thirty-eight, in all, have been of such disgrace. It will be seen, that while the insta defection are much fewer than is generally believed; that the greater number were originally trained in bodies not estant Episcopal; or that that they were known, while Church, as party "Low Churchmen," and were charac by loose notions and loose practices, before their adop the ultraisms through which they finally lost their balan went over to Rome. And as the tide is beginning to set strongly toward the Church just now, it would not be s if a good deal of drift-wood floated along with it. T Church, most assuredly, is not to be held responsible for crooked sticks that may be borne upon the current, thou may well be a little cautious as to the use she makes of We throw out this hint for the benefit of our Standing mittees. The strength of the Church does not consist in bers. There is no real growth where there is no true assimi

o add to the value of the Catalogue for future historical refer-
, asterisks are prefixed to the names of those who have entered
Romish priesthood, and notes are appended to the list, by
of indicating facts and idiosyncrasies, which had their bear-
in individual cases.

Names.	Year.	Diocese.
*Virgil Horace Barber	1815	N. Y.
*Daniel Barber	1815	N. H.
*John Kewley, M. D.	1816	N. Y.
George Edmund Ironsides	1818	N. Y.
Calvin White	1820	Conn.
——— Annesley		N. J.
*Pierce Connelly	1835	Miss.
*George F. Haskins	1839	Mass.
*James Roosevelt Bayley	1842	N. Y.
*Nathaniel Augustus Hewitt	1845	Md.
Henry Major	1846	Pa.
William Henry Hoit	1846	Vt.
*Edgar P. Wadhams	1846	N. Y.
George Allen	1847	Pa.
C. Donald MacLeod	1849	N. C.
*John Murray Forbes, D. D.	1849	N. Y.
*Thomas Scott Preston	1849	N. Y.
Jedediah Huntington, M. D.	1849	S. C.
William J. Bakewell	1850	W.N.Y.
Geo. Lamb Roberts	1850	Ind.
Gardner Jones	1850	Ga.
Ferdinand E. White	1851	N. Y.
Edward J. Ives	1851	Conn.
*William Everett, M. D.	1851	N. Y.
Henry L. Richards	1852	Ohio.
Peter Sanford Burchan	1852	N. Y.
Frederick W. Pollard	1852	Mass.
Norman C. Stoughton	1852	N. Y.
Levi Silliman Ives, D. D., LL. D.	1852	N. C.
*Francis Asbury Baker	1853	Md.
*Dwight Edwards Lyman	1853	Pa.
John McKeon	1854	Ill.

No.	Names.	Year.	Diocese.
33.	Homer Wheaton	1855	N. Y.
34.	Benjamin W. Whicher	1855	W.N.Y.
35.	William Markoe	1855	Wis.
36.	*Geo. Hobart Doane, M. D.	1855	N. J.
37.	George C. Foote	1857	Pa.
38.	J. Ambler Weed	1858	Va.

Of these, Nos. 1, 2, 8, 10, 12, 18, and probably 27, were originally Congregationalists.

Nos. 4, 5, 7, 15, 29, 31, 32, 37, and probably 13, 33, and 34, were originally Presbyterians.

Nos. 11, 14, 20, 22, 30, were Methodists originally, and Nos. 3 and 5 subsequently so.

Nos. 1, 3, 8, 11, 16, 19, 25, 38, were noted "Evangelicals," who afterwards, without sufficient substratum, adopted other views.

No. 3, was first a Romanist; then a Methodist; afterwards a decided "Low Churchman," as Rector of St. George's Church, New York.

Nos. 7, 11, 16, 19, 23 have since returned to the Church.

Nos. 11, 38 were of the Virginia Theological Seminary. The fact that others were of the General Seminary, is not to our purpose, which is to refute the assertion, that sound, positive Church principles lead men to Rome. They never have led a man there, and they never will. The later "Oxford Tracts," after they became imbued with Romish Mediævalism prepared, too, for the most part, by men once Ultra Low Church men, and the writings of these men after the Tracts were suppressed, undoubtedly were instruments in the perversion of some morbid, visionary young men and old men, at the General Theological Seminary and elsewhere; but neither the Seminary nor sound Church principles, are to be held responsible for their folly and disgrace. We shall now take up the above list of perverts, and examine each case individually.

No. 1. At first a Congregationalist; then a noted "Evangelical;" was perverted by Archbishop Cheverus, of Boston. His disposition was restless, ever after fancies and idealities. His

perversion was followed by his divorce, contrary to the law of God; his wife assumed the Vows of Sisterhood.

No. 2. Father of No. 1. Also a Congregationalist; an aged and weak man, of no positive views in theology. Introduced Romanism into Claremont, N. H., as the instrument of Cheverus.

No. 3. Educated at St. Omers; was a Jesuit lay-brother and physician; professing to renounce Romanism, he became, first, a Methodist preacher; then, in 1804, was ordered Deacon by Bishop Claggett; was the eloquent Rector of St. George's Church, New York; afterwards became a Roman Priest in Italy. Was either of unfixed mind and habits, or else was, throughout, playing the deep game of a Jesuit.

No. 4. Originally a Presbyterian of the ultra Calvinistic School.

No. 5. First a Presbyterian; then a Methodist; an inoffensive, but worthy man, who changed some three or four times: he lived to an advanced age, and, during the latter years of his life, often attended upon the Services of our Church. He finally ceased doing so, under the remonstrance of the Romish priesthood. His heart was never wholly estranged from the Church, nor his mind convinced of our loss of Catholicity.

No. 6. Nothing certainly known of him; save that after entering the Church, he remained content with the unfixed teaching of unstudious men; it is believed that he had previously been a Baptist.

No. 7. Was moved to his defection by a "horror of the restless spirit of democracy in the Church and State," and an apparent possession by Rome of proper control over its adherents. First a Presbyterian; of aspiring views; separated from his wife after his apostacy; she assumed "the vows," became "Mother Superior;" and he, Chaplain of the Romish Earl of Shrewsbury. This case, like that of Barber, shows with what facility Popery violates the Divine law of Marriage. He has since (in 1849) returned to the Church.

No. 8. Originally a Congregationalist; then an "Evangelical;" a restless Churchman, and visionary; thought himself not appreciated, &c. A fair pulpit orator; ordered Deacon in

1829; in ten years went literally to Rome, and became a member of the Order of Jesuits.

No. 9. Was consecrated a Bishop (of Newark) under the Roman intrusion, Oct. 30, 1853, by the notorious Bedini, the Pope's Nuncio; the libertine and debauchee, the butcher of Ugo Bassi, by whose order one hundred and thirty-three victims were murdered at Bologna, and who sneaked out of our country between two days, in 1854.

No. 10. Originally a Congregationalist; son of an eminent Puritan preacher; was re-baptized but a year or two before his defection.

No. 11. First a Methodist; then a Low Churchman; became a Romish editor; returned to the Church; then again went back to Popery.

No. 12. Originally a Congregationalist; before his defection to Rome he was officially censured by his Bishop for Romish practices.

No. 13. Not by birth a Churchman, and while in the Church a thorough Mediævalist.

No. 14. Originally a Methodist; always when in the Church a languid Churchman; his ministerial duties were laid aside for those of a secular teacher.

No. 15. A Presbyterian in origin; young, enthusiastic, full of Mediævalism; wrote "The Voice of the Anglican Church on Confession," fortified with garbled extracts from English divines; was Penitentiary of the Religious Order of the Holy Cross at Valle Crucis, of which Bishop Ives was Superior; afterwards became a Romanist in Switzerland.

No. 16. Began his Ministry in the Church as a Calvinist and "Evangelical;" was entrapped, in 1849, by those false notions of Church Unity and Authority, which the later Tract writers put forth, and by garbled Romish quotations from the Fathers; his Christian conscience and manliness have proved too strong for his Romish experience; in 1859 he returned to the true Branch of Christ's One Catholic Church.

No. 17. Was assistant to, and seceded with Dr. Forbes; now Chancellor to Archbishop Hughes, who doubtless keeps a sharp eye on him. Before his apostacy, he complained that he

could not carry out in the Church what he called the "Catholic System," but which was nothing more or less than the symbolism of Mediæval Romanism.

No. 18. Originally a Congregationalist; was "converted," and joined that "Church;" became skeptical, and adopted very queer notions generally, at last got into the Church, and was for several years without employ in the Ministry, but preached Auricular Confession and other Romish doctrines, and was author of an infamous Tract on the Sacrament of Penance. After he went over to Rome, he wrote an indelicate book, "Lady Alice, or the New Una," intended to reconcile Romanism and Catholicism. He also wrote "Alban," supposed to be an autobiography, a strange book, in which the hero of the story professed a belief in Moses, a denial of Christ, and talked of being circumcised. He also wrote other Romish works.

No. 19. Originally, and for twenty-five years, an English Unitarian; then a Low Churchman; afterwards, having tried Romanism, he returned to the Church in 1857.

No. 20. First a Methodist; then a languid Churchman; of no stability or well-grounded theological views.

No. 21. First a Romanist; then German Reformed; associated with the Nevin School of theology; then a Romanist again, connected with the Notre Dame University. Very unpractical; had reached Deacon's Orders only.

No. 22. Originally a Methodist; when in the Church, morbidly jealous; complained of neglect; altered in his Prayer-Book the 185th Hymn, and introduced irregularities into the Services; thoroughly Mediæval in his tastes and theology.

No. 23. Born in the Church; unsuccessful in the Ministry, and peddled books of the American Sunday School Union; reduced to the most abject poverty and went over to Rome; has already returned to the Communion of the Church.

No. 24. A young man, thoroughly disloyal to the Church from the outset; disgustingly silly and puerile in his Ministrations, *e. g.*, advising his Communicants to wash their mouths and brush their teeth before receiving the Communion, &c., &c., &c.; positively denied all intention to go over to Rome, although his arrangements to do so were already made.

No. 25. Originally a "Low" Churchman, of the lowest sort; temperament morbid; prostrated by loss of health.

No. 27. Not a Churchman by birth; believed to be Congregational; a moody ascetic and dyspeptic; a thorough-going Mediævalist, a young and kindly man.

No. 28. Unemployed for several years.

No. 29. A Presbyterian revivalist originally; ardent, impetuous, impatient of results; became mentally disordered, if not insane. His father was also subject to constitutional disease, which affected his brain to derangement.

No. 30. Originally a Methodist; educated in a Romish Seminary; three brothers of his became Romanists before their death; a simple-hearted, credulous man, easily duped; continued to officiate up to the moment of his defection.

No. 31. A Presbyterian by origin; of musical and imaginative tastes; Mediæval in learning; impractical in his Ministry.

No. 32. An Irish Presbyterian originally; a languid, inefficient man; had attained to Deacon's Orders only.

No. 33. Not brought up in the Church; a retiring, sensitive man, of many virtues; given to reading that sentimental Church literature which whines but does not work; lives in retirement.

No. 34. Not a Churchman originally; probably a Presbyterian; little known of him.

No. 35. His fantastic tricks in ritualism led to the adoption of a Canon on Ritual Uniformity, in the diocese of Wisconsin, to which he belonged. He was young, ardent, impatient of results, and excessively fond of Mediæval restorations. With increasing wisdom, he may return to the Church of his family and friends.

No. 36. Young and ardent; had just passed his majority; had reached Deacon's Orders only; was influenced by imagination; acted in violation of filial duty, taking the final step in resistance to his father's pleading, that he should act by reason and not by self-will, in despite of reason. A spoiled child.

No. 37. A Presbyterian originally; not ten years in the Ministry before his defection.

No. 38. A languid "Evangelical;" a graduate of the Virginia Theological Seminary.

Here then we have the whole list. During the last two hundred and fifty years, and from the ranks of over five thousand Clergy, only thirty-eight in all have thus proved treacherous to their Ordination vows. And when we remember the sources from which the ranks of our Ministry have been filled, we are far from being surprised that this number is as large as it is. Of the *thirty-eight* Clergymen who have gone over to Rome, *twenty-five* certainly, and probably more, came from one or other of the Sects about us. Eight were known, previous to their conversion, as party men of the self-styled "Evangelical" camp. Of the very few on the list before us who were born in the Church, we are able to say confidently, in nearly every instance, that constitutional temperament, or physical disease, or moral obliquity, (and we have not, for obvious reasons, specified these cases,) fully accounts for their erratic course. There are one or two names remaining unnoticed; but their subsidence into the depths whither they have sunk, has left not a ripple even to excite observation; and we have been able as yet to learn nothing respecting them. So that we may safely challenge the world to point out a single instance in which a Minister of the American Church, thoroughly imbued with the old-fashioned sound Church views, has ever abandoned the Faith, and gone over to the Church of Rome. They are not the men who become Romanists, or are capable of becoming so. The very foundation on which they stand, Holy Scripture and Primitive Antiquity, is as utterly and thoroughly anti-Romish as it can be.

It is also equally certain, and for the same reason, that as these men do not become Romanists, so they do not become Rationalists; and we have both facts and arguments to sustain us in this position; but we do not enter into that examination now; we may do it on another occasion. The only hope and security for an Evangelical Faith lies, in the long run, in its union with strong, positive views on the Institutions of the Gospel. That it should be so, is a matter of the strongest probability; that it is so, is an absolute and undeniable fact.

Two or three years ago, an attempt was made to bring reproach upon sound Church principles in England, by charging

upon them the origin and cause of the more numerous defections to Rome from the Mother Church. We do not hesitate to say, that there have been, and there are now, in the English Church, teachings and practices by a class of men, represented in part by the "*Union Newspaper*," for which no party in the Church, "High" or "Low," is to be held responsible. How numerous in the English Church these men are, we have no means of estimating. Judging from their writings and their temper, they are Romanists in reality; not unlikely some of them are Jesuits in disguise, acting in connivance with Wiseman, Newman, and the perverts who seem to have lost their honor and their honesty when they lost their Faith; and their object is, palpably, the dastardly one of working in the dark till they shall be unearthed and driven from their hiding places. But the Romanizing movement, in its inception, did not spring from them. They are its victims and its tools, not its originators. We have already called attention to this point, and we repeat here facts which we have quoted once before, and we shall continue to repeat them as often as there is occasion for it.

"A correspondent of the (London) *Clerical Journal* asks, 'Why it is that High Churchism, or Puseyism, as it is called, has supplied, and is still supplying, so many recruits to the Church of Rome, and why have none gone over to the Church of Rome from the Low Church party, or "Evangelicals," as they are called?'"

"A subsequent Number of the same paper contains several answers to this question. One correspondent says:

"The best and the only honest answer is to deny the truth of such a supposition altogether. Why, the real notorious fact is, that out of every twelve persons who have gone over to Rome, ten or eleven have been either (1) Low Churchmen, (2) the children of Low Church parents, or (3) Dissenters, or Scotch Presbyterians. True it is, that some of these persons have become nominally High Church men for a time before they went over to Rome, and have generally made themselves notorious for their indiscreet zeal as long as they remained among us: but, beginning with Dr. Newman, (whom I remember as an evangelical leader at Oxford, Secretary to the Missionary Society, and a supporter of the Bible Society,) down to the most recent convert of whom I have heard, Mr. Marshall, son of a popular Presbyterian minister at Edinburgh, and grandson of Legh Richmond, I could give a list of one hundred converts, ninety-nine of whom would fall under one of the three classes above named. For myself,

have had considerable opportunity for observation, and yet I never knew a
gle solitary instance of a sound Anglican Churchman going over to Rome.
t your correspondent retort the question upon his Low Church or no Church
ighbors, and ask why have Recordism, Simeonism, and Dissenterism furnished
e greater number of converts to Rome? And he may add another query, why
s Low Churchism supplied so many recruits to the Irvingites, besides filling
e Agapemone of Mr. Prince, and furnishing forty clergymen to the mischiev-
s sect who call themselves 'Plymouth Brethren.'"

Another correspondent says :

"Dr. Newman himself, it is well known, was originally a Low Churchman,
d was Secretary to the Church Missionary Society when at Oxford. I believe
would not be difficult to name other instances. Again, how is it that some
our large towns—Birmingham for instance—where Low Church influence is
edominant, are likewise the strongholds of Romanism? The truth seems to
that the old adage, 'extremes meet,' holds good in this case. As a proof of it,
any one compare the favorite hymns of Low Churchmen and Dissenters with
e same class of compositions prevalent in the Church of Rome, and observe
e mawkish, semi-sensual character of both, the only difference being in the
ject of worship—the Saviour in the one case, the blessed Virgin in the other.
e spirit of both is equally remote from the sober, manly piety of the Church
England, and is symptomatic of that restlessness and craving after novelty
d excitement which leads first to Dissent, and then, 'finding no rest for the
le of its foot,' takes refuge in the gorgeous ritual and lulling infallibility of
me."

And another correspondent says :

"As far as the present writer remembers, the first eminent seceder of late
ars was the Hon. George Spencer, brother to the late Earl Spencer. It was
ll known in Northants that he was previously a very Low Churchman. Dr.
wman and Dr. Manning began with very Low Church principles. So did Mr.
dsworth. They were at one time inoculated with High Church principles,
never had them in the natural way. It is the same thing which is continu-
r happening now. Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Jews, and Quakers, have
ed the Church of England for a time, and then gone further. Can any in-
nce be found of a seceder who was brought up in the Church of England, and
ined in the school of Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, and their allies and
ociates?"

Before leaving this list of Perverts, we observe that a much
ger number of those who were born and trained in the Ro-
an Schism, some of whom had been recipients of its digni-
s, have at various times left her Ministry as Converts to our
n branch of the Catholic Church. In England and Ireland,
is list in later times is already very large, and in the latter
untry especially, is constantly increasing.

We here append the names of a few, as a specimen only of
e list which, as we may have opportunity, we hope at some
ture time to complete.

ROMISH PRIESTS WHO HAVE PROFESSED THE CATHOLIC FAITH AND BEEN RECEIVED BY US.

1. Rev. Charles H. Wharton, D. D., 1780, (died 1833,) N. J.
2. Rev. Francis S. Todrig, 1834, Md. Chaplain on Estate of Hon. Charles Carroll, Signer of Declaration of Independence.
3. Rev. Prof. John Fielding, 1840, Ga.
4. Rev. Dr. John Niglas, S. T. D., 1851, Ill.
5. Rev. James Geo. Leason, 1851, Md.
6. Rev. Dr. Stephen C. Massoch, 1853, Mo.
7. Rev. Dr. John Bapt. M. Pendelupè, 1856, Wis.
8. Rev. Louis D. Rivieccio, 1860, Cal.

Again, in striking this "balance sheet," it may be well to ask how many Protestant Bishops, since the Reformation, have renounced their Protestantism and returned to Popery? Only two; viz:

1. Dr. John Gordon, 1668, Bishop of Galloway, Scotland.
2. Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, 1852, of N. C.

How many Romish Bishops since that era, and unconnected with the Anglican Reform, have renounced Popery? At least fourteen; viz:

1. Peter Paul Vergerio, Bishop of Capo d' Istria, 1546, and Papal Nuncio.
2. His brother, also a Bishop, followed. (See Middleton' Evang. Biography.)
3. Herman de Wida, Archbishop of Cologne, 1548.
4. John A'Lasco, 1549, of Poland. (See Middleton, and Burnet's Reformation.)
5. Dr. John Egidio, 1550, Bishop elect of Tortosa. (See Geddes' Martyrology.)
6. Dr. Barth. Caranza, 1575, Abp. of Toledo. (See Llorente's Inquisition.)
7. Dr. John Bale, (or Bayley,) 1550, Bishop of Ossory.
8. Dr. Alexander Gordon, 1570, Bishop of Galloway, and Archbishop of Athens *in partibus.** (See Keith's Scottish Bishops.)

---

* *In partibus Infidelium.* Bishops in countries overrun by Infidels. These Bishops are vicars of the Pope, having no proper See of their own; and certainly never visiting the See to which they are named. Archbishop Kenrick, when assistant

9. Spifame, 1557, Bishop of Nevers.
10. Dr. Jo. Ant. Caraccioli, 1560, Bishop of Troyes.
11. Gebhard, 1600, Archbishop of Cologne.
12. John Canute, 1614, a Danish Bishop.
13. Dr. Marc Antonio de Dominis, 1617, Abp. of Spalatro.
14. Lord Dunboyne, 1794, Bishop of Cork.

We might name here also the Jansenist Succession of Bishops, who are excommunicated and cursed by his Holiness on the occasion of every Jansenist Consecration, as a set of incorrigible heretics. Or we might give illustrations of the Infidel set of Papal prelates, to which belonged Huet of Avranches, Talleyrand, &c., but we forbear.

Bishop of Philada., was named "Bishop of Arath *in partibus*;" and Cardinal Wiseman, when first elevated, was named "Bishop of Melipotamus *in partibus*." Where is Arath, or where is Melipotamus? These nominal Bishops are but vicars of the Bishop of Rome; our Fathers are Vicars of Christ.

Art. VI.—TWO LETTERS TO MONSEIGNEUR PARISIS, BISHOP OF ARRAS.

Histoire du Bienheureux Pierre Claver, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Par J. M. S. Daurignac. Deuxième Edition. Lyon: 1855. 2 vols., 12mo.

[Instead of reviewing this extraordinary biography of Padre Claver, which has become a staple of the Jesuits, on the continent of Europe, we have obtained from the author, the Rev. A. C. Coxe, D. D., a translation of his Letters to the Bishop of Arras, which, our readers may remember, were published in 1856, by the Anglo-Continental Society, at Oxford. These Letters were written in the French language, and after passing the critical inspection, and undergoing the careful and judicious emendation of the Society's French editor, the Rev. F. Godfray, of the Isle of Jersey, have been widely circulated on the continent of Europe; but they have never appeared in English, and the important exhibition which they contain of the morality and tactics of the Jesuits, in dealing with the Anglican Church, has never been brought before English readers. The extraordinary condition of Southern Europe at the present time gives to these Letters great interest, and to the Society in whose behalf they were written unprecedented importance.—Ed.]

I.

Baltimore, March 25, 1856.

My Lord,

I venture to hope, in addressing your Lordship with sentiments of respect for your Apostolic Office, and influenced by Christian charity, that you will not be the less inclined to examine what I have to say, because I am a stranger. If I may but succeed in gaining your attention, I shall be able to convince your Lordship, that you have lent the respectable authority of your name and ecclesiastical dignity to publications which are giving currency to certain statements as history, which have no foundation in fact. These erroneous statements, and others of the same kind, have operated only too powerfully to multiply the obstacles which stand in the way of a blessed re-union among Christians, and they tend greatly to exaggerate the important differences which really exist, between the Anglican communion and the other Churches of Western Europe.

It may surprise you, my Lord, that an American presbyter should exhibit a sensitive interest in what chiefly concerns the

Church of England. But I beg you to remember the words of the Psalmist—*Sicut sagittæ in manu potentis, ita filii excussorum.* The Anglican Church, our venerable mother, is assailed with calumnies and insinuations; and lo! that is fulfilled in her which is written—"she shall not be confounded when she speaks with her enemies in the gate." She may hold her peace; for she has children to lift up their voice for her from the uttermost parts of the earth. It will be something if, by so doing, I may only dispel the notion that has so long prevailed among you, in France, that the Anglican Communion has no existence except as connected with the Crown and Parliament of England. Though a presbyter of her Communion, and one who has officiated at the altars of her parish-churches, I belong to a branch of the Church, which for eighty years has flourished in the primitive condition of entire separation from State patronage and control, and which has proved that the existence of the Anglican Communion does not depend upon its relations to the State. On the contrary, the Anglo-American Church which only existed in the germ before the establishment of American Independence, has, since that epoch, developed with extraordinary rapidity. It is now a great National Church, extending through the entire Republic, and has more than two thousand clergymen under the jurisdiction of more than thirty Bishops. These Bishops derive their consecration from others who were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1787; but they are in no wise subject to that Most Reverend Primate, and sustain towards him only the relations of fraternal love, and of Christian and Catholic communion. They are subject to the Governing Synod of our own Church, under the presidency of our Senior Bishop; for the rule of presidency by seniority of consecration, obtains among us, as in primitive times among the Churches of Africa. We recognize, however, the primitive Canons, and so far as they can apply to a Church situated in a country for which no General Council has legislated, we obey them. We profess, also, and tenaciously maintain, the Faith of the Holy Catholic Church, as set forth by those Councils, which always, everywhere and by all, have been acknowledged as Œcumenical.

Your Lordship will see, then, that my position with r to the Church of England allows me to speak of her co with filial reverence and yet with entire frankness, as be no sense, her subject, or interested in any of her local an poral affairs. My apology for conceiving myself at lib utter a word in her defence, must be found in the circu ces of a personal nature to which I propose to ask your tion. These circumstances seemed to designate me as to speak for her; and in view of the melancholy ignor her true character, which I found to prevail among your ligionists in France and Italy, I felt that I owed it to th correct your misapprehensions. To borrow the words o illustrious compatriot St. Bernard, when he repudiat novelty of the Immaculate Conception, I might safely *Nescio an sine gravi offensa etiam vestri omnium dissi potuerim.*

The writings of your own Bossuet are evidence that h judices against the Church of England arose from r misapprehensions. He applied to her case a kind of rea which proceeded, mainly, on just principles; but he n the case itself, and never discovered that his argument le in fact, untouched. He took great pains to prove wh not only admits, but professes; and then, assuming her d he condemned her. The weight of his name has betrayed others into a similar error. His misapprehensions have l the convictions of thousands; and the variety of his wr and the frequent recurrence, in them, of misstatements c point, has connected them with almost every subject wh terests thinking men. Modern writers have taken the pressions at second-hand, and have reproduced them w the prestige of his authority. The pages of Nicolas, o mez, and of the Count Joseph de Maistre, for example, li swarm with erroneous ideas respecting the Church of En and contain many falsehoods, which I am bound, in cl to consider as ignorantly propagated by these authors. cause is best assailed by a fair exhibition of its characte if the Anglican Communion is what these authors supp cannot be necessary to blacken it by assertions which ev

telligent man who speaks the English language must know to be untrue. Moreover, supposing us to be heretics, it is the duty of Christians to prescribe for the actual malady of our Church, and not to excite our passions, by accusing us of vices and evils which do not exist. "When one would reprove effectually," says the amiable Pascal, "or when one would convince another that he is mistaken, it is important to discover how he himself looks at the question, for ordinarily he is right as he views the matter, and so much we ought to concede." If this principle of morals, so full of the spirit of our holy religion, had been mutually and practically understood by the controvertists of England and France, the alliance of these great nations would undoubtedly have become a more substantial and a more sacred one than that which now exists between their victorious armies.

The historical mistakes, to which I desire to direct your Lordship's kind attention, have reference to the Origin, and to the Reformation of the Church of England. I am sorry to say these mistakes prevail almost everywhere on the Continent of Europe. Had the learned works of her great divines been more freely circulated beyond the pale of their own communion, such mistakes could not have gained currency. The languages of the Continent are familiarly known in England: the great Gallican authors are universally read by her divines; but, unfortunately, our brethren in France do not return the compliment, by studying the English language, and becoming acquainted with the writings of those great Anglican theologians, who merit a place among the doctors of the Church Catholic; and whose works, distributed wherever the Anglo-Saxon race has penetrated, have fixed it in the heart of all competent judges who speak the English tongue, that the doctrines they maintain are the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and the same which His Church has held from the beginning. Yes, my Lord, I would instance the works of Hooker, surnamed "the Judicious;" of Taylor, the Chrysostom of England; of Laud, the Cyprian of the seventeenth century; and I might cite many others, whose writings, had they been only known, as they deserve to be, among Gallicans, would have saved me the trouble

of writing this letter. Of Hooker's immortal writings, even a Pope asserted that "time would beget more and more reverence for them, and that they must endure till the flame that shall burn all things": and had you been familiar with his works, and with his times, my Lord, it is impossible that you should have lent the sanction of your approval to the garbled, or utterly groundless statements, which you have lately helped to circulate, in spite of the fact that similar falsifications have been frequently exposed, refuted and contrasted with the substantial truth.

And so I come to the point, which is to ask your earnest reconsideration of the merits of a work of which your Lordship is the avowed patron; I mean the *soi-disant* "History of the Blessed Peter Claver, of the Company of Jesus, Apostle of the Negroes of Carthagena and of the West Indies." The book is widely circulated, and has an appearance of being written with candor and piety. Its author pretends to give the veritable history of a benevolent Jesuit of the seventeenth century, who wrought a variety of miracles. I am far from desiring to detract in the least from the genuine character or reputation of this good man, for such he probably was; and I hold it a very serious matter, on a merely superficial knowledge of facts, to pass a judgment on any soul that has lived, and long since passed away, and whose record is with God. To that Master he must stand or fall, and I must not presume to judge him; and I take real pleasure in believing that he was a holy servant of the Lord. There was in the East Indies, once, a Jesuit of similar spirit; a man singularly free from the peculiarities of the Society to which he has given the eclat of his name, and whose authentic history is dear to all Christians, in spite of the fables which have been superadded by unscrupulous and fanatical biographers. I refer to St. Francis Xavier, whose renown seems to have suggested the idea of raking up the memory of Claver, in order that the West Indies might have a Jesuit Saint, as well as the East. I wish his reputation had not been made to suffer in the same way, by the enthusiasm of his historians. Yet faulty as his biography may be, I should not have thought of subjecting it to this examination, in spite of

its wide circulation, had it not received your Lordship's endorsement. That such endorsement was inadvertently given I must believe, and yet it is extraordinary that your name should have been permitted to remain in connection with it for a considerable time. Your approbation is very conspicuously paraded at the beginning of the work, and is as follows :—

"The History of the B. Peter Claver is pious, interesting, well arranged, very happily expressed, and adapted as well to re-animate the lukewarm, as to promote the perfection of the just. Some of the miracles wrought by this man of God, may perhaps appear strange to many men of the world, but, seeing they have been cited as proofs of sanctity, in the Acts accepted for his canonization, there is no further any room for debate about them. No body can flatter himself that he is more rigorous, as to the fact of miracles, than the Court of Rome. I can only express my wishes, therefore, that the work may find many readers, and I allow these lines to serve as a recommendation for my own diocese."

It is no part of my purpose, my Lord, to enter largely upon the matter of these miracles, nor upon the importance to be attached to the Roman Process which you regard as placing their genuineness beyond question. The Court of Rome* cannot be accused of concealing the principles on which its several "Congregations" proceed for the verifying of pretended facts. How "rigorous" they are in exacting free testimony and opinion, has been lately evidenced in the affair of the New Dogma. It is certain, however, that in those parts of the world where the writings of Liguori are not recognized as a Code of Morals, the opinion of the authorities at Rome is by no means accepted as decisive, more especially when it demands implicit reverence, and seems to discourage investigation. Such distrust is surely pardonable, when we find miracles attributed to Peter Claver, in many respects more surprising than those of our Saviour and His Apostles ; or when we are gravely told, on the one

* For an important exposure of this Court, we are indebted to a Frenchman, M. Dunnou, whose Essay was published in Paris in 1818, and in America, at Philadelphia, 1837.

hand, that he raised the dead, and, on the other, that he performed the juggler's trick of making a basket-full of sound eggs, out of broken ones which had been upset upon a pavement! If many other of the signs and wonders which the B. Peter is said to have wrought, be matters of fact, why have two centuries been suffered to pass, during which mankind have been left in ignorance of these striking evidences of the truth of the religion which he preached? What *facts* were adduced at Rome, and *accepted*, as proofs of these Acts? Unless you can give incontrovertible testimony in support of such extraordinary stories, you must allow me to ask you, my Lord, whether you are not, by approving such apparent fables, doing your best to shake the faith of millions, as to the miracles which are recorded in the Gospel, and the belief of which is essential to their salvation? Are you not teaching men to regard all alleged miracles as equally apocryphal, and so giving them a strong objection to the truth of Holy Scripture itself? When I reflect how lately France has experienced the worst results of such experiments upon human intelligence, in a frightful revolt from GOD, and an open rejection of the Gospel, I wonder, my Lord, that you and others of the hierarchy are so boldly confident as to renew these ventures upon popular credulity. Had the clergy of France taught their flocks nothing more than those great truths which, in the primitive age, compelled the assent of all who hearkened to them, there would never have been such a Revolution as enthroned a harlot, in Notre Dame, on the altar of God. How, then, are we to understand the infatuation which returns to the same fatal course of trifling with the common sense of a nation, and that too in an age more impatient than any which has preceded it, of attempts to force upon it as truth, anything which cannot be freely and thoroughly examined?

I have the less hesitation in speaking of this Biography as corrupt, because, in that of one of our own contemporaries, and in matters admitting of refutation by the testimony of persons still alive, statements notoriously false have been set forth under the patronage of dignitaries of your Communion. The late Cardinal Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who for

many years resided amongst us in the United States, was deservedly the object of general respect and affection. If ever the Court of Rome should proceed to the Canonization of this amiable relic of old Gallicanism, it would accord the honor to one of the best men that has lately received it; but if among "the acts accepted for his Canonization," the Court of Rome should admit a number of the stories told by his biographer, M. Heren-Dubourg, I am forced to say, my Lord, that it would grievously task the consciences of many of the professed faithful in Boston, where that author has made sport for thousands by his monstrous exaggerations, and where even the most servile adherents of Rome are obliged to invent excuses for his absurdities. If such biographies of a Gallican are published among his contemporaries, what may not be fabricated after the lapse of two centuries, in honor of a Jesuit, and by a Liguorian pen?

I have alluded to my personal interest in this history of Claver. It grew out of the circumstances in which it first attracted my notice. Arriving at Rome in 1851, a few days subsequent to the event of his Beatification, I found it the subject of general remark. A pamphlet had been freely circulated through the city, which, in a compendious form, gave, in the Italian language, the same story concerning the newly Beatified saint, which has received your public approbation. It caused some merriment, and more of a deeper sensation, among the English residents at Rome; and as I several times officiated for their chaplain, at the humble altar of the English congregation, I was sometimes asked how an exposure might be made of the astounding effrontery with which this pamphlet had misrepresented the history and character of the Church of England. It was palpable that the author had given circulation to a gross falsehood concerning the conversion to Romanism of certain Englishmen in the seventeenth century, and the absurdity of the narrative in this particular was a sufficient index of its trustworthiness in others hardly more extravagant, though full of the miraculous. No one who has any acquaintance with history will require an explanation of the surprise with which Anglicans, generally, read in the pamphlet which I have mentioned the following anecdote:—

"In the year 1639, Don Federigo de Toledo, having captured divers Dutch and English, (heretics,) brought them into Carthagena, where they were confined in prison ships, near the town. Peter congratulated himself on the opportunity thus offered for converting them to God, and resolved to devote himself entirely to the work of their salvation. He obtained permission to celebrate mass in presence of 700 English, on the deck of their vessel; and he performed this duty with such fervor, and with the outpouring of such floods of tears, that the heretics were affected with the most lively impressions. Subsequently, though it was contrary to his ordinary habit, he accepted an invitation to take some refreshments with the captain, and with a number of heretics besides, among the most respectable of the company. At table he conducted himself with an extreme affability, and by degrees turned the conversation upon the subject of religion. By and by they expressed a desire to introduce him to their bishop, *whom they styled the Archdeacon of London;* and to this he readily assented, with expressions of gratitude for the honor they proposed to confer upon him. The bishop proved to be an aged man. His white hairs, and his grave but singularly sweet and gentle manner, gave him a most venerable appearance. Father Claver presented himself with marked civility before this respectable bishop, and omitted nothing that might attract his good will. He soon found himself alone with him, and was enabled to carry on a conversation upon religious matters which they had already begun. The result of their interview was, that the good old man, who was gifted with a large intelligence, and a most enlightened judgment, *acknowledged himself beaten*, by the force of Father Claver's arguments, and declared himself from that moment a Catholic. At the same time, he stated, that nevertheless, *he could not renounce his religion openly*, because he had a wife and children, and enjoyed, at home, a benefice equally lucrative and honorable. He added, that if he should openly reconcile himself to Rome, he would be forced, *ipso facto*, to let his benefice revert to the Royal Exchequer, and that his numerous family would be deprived of the resources of life; meanwhile, from the bottom of his heart, he proposed to be a good Catholic, daily imploring GOD to give him grace, and to open the opportunity for a public profession of his faith. The good Father Claver did not fail to stimulate the courage of the bishop; but, instead of trusting for success to human instrumentality, he had recourse to prayer and extraordinary acts of self-discipline, to which he devoted himself with renewed fervor to implore the succor of Heaven.

Nor were his efforts and supplications ineffectual. A week later, while he was ministering in the hospital of St. Sebastian, what does he behold? Lo! the Archdeacon,* borne upon a litter, grievously sick, and followed by an immense crowd. After the ordinary salutations, the bishop announced that he had come to discharge a promise which he had made to God, and he besought Peter Claver, as his spiritual father, not to desert him in so trying a moment, which he felt to be very near the last of his life. The good father lavished upon him all possible consolations, and during the few succeeding days that he lived never quitted him, but waited on him without remission. Having renounced his errors, and made profession of his new faith, the old man received the last sacraments with a devotion the most fervent, and so departed from the world, with a spirit at rest, and filled with confidence in the goodness of God. Father Claver solemnly celebrated his obsequies in the presence of numerous spectators of all ranks and conditions.

---

* Query—bishop?

The conversion and death of the Anglican Bishop having created a great sensation in the fleet, the heretics were greatly impressed and astonished. Many of them, influenced by the HOLY SPIRIT, began to entertain doubts concerning their faith, and serious thoughts as to their eternal salvation. As soon as they could obtain permission to go on shore,—for in fear of the pestilence it had been previously refused,—they ran *en masse* to Peter Claver, begging him to instruct them in religion. Convinced of their errors, they made their submission, and soon, nearly *seven hundred* of them became reconciled to God and to His Church. Of the sick in the hospital, moreover, some opened their eyes to the truth and embraced it, less affected by the preaching than by the exemplary life of Peter Claver."

Now, my Lord, I have no means of disproving the historical fact here alleged concerning Don Federigo de Toledo, but even this appears by no means well established. The date, 1639, supplied by the Italian *brochure* of which I have spoken, disappears in your French work; but in that year, although it is true that the Spaniards were at war with the Dutch, England was so far from being the ally of Holland, that she sorely piqued that power, by maintaining a treaty which was then in actual existence between herself and Spain, and by permitting Spanish vessels, by virtue of that treaty, to supply themselves with victuals and munitions of war in English ports, at the very moment when Dutch men-of-war were pursuing them in the Channel.* This single fact suggests the gravest difficulties. But again, it appears to me a greater miracle than some of the others, "accepted at Rome," in process of his Canonization, that the Blessed Peter's eloquence was unlimited by the difficulties of foreign tongues, and that he was able to preach with equal success in his own language, and in that of the English and Dutch mariners. Now, it is not every Englishman who can talk to English sailors intelligibly, however learned and intelligent, or even eloquent he may be; for sailors have a dialect of their own, in which it is necessary to address them, with a degree of condescension to their ways of thought, if you would do them much good. It was miracle the first, then, that he could so readily and so eloquently address himself to these seamen, in their several tongues; and it was miracle the second, that such a concourse of heretics were so soon and so amazingly converted, by mere talk. It would not have been so much of

*Howell's Familiar Letters, No. XL., London, 1645.

a wonder had it been simply said that the 700 heretics were immediately converted after becoming prisoners to the Spaniards. The Spanish vessels, which the English took from the famous Armada, were loaded with missionaries in the shape of divers instruments of torture, which the sailors could instantly comprehend; and every Spanish port, in those days, was provided with schools for converting heretics, in the shape of the Inquisition.

But as to the Anglican Bishop? On this head there is happily no need of conjecture, for everybody knows that nobody of this rank served in the English navy, in the seventeenth century, or could possibly have been found at Carthagena. Nor do I undertake to refute the conversion of an Anglican prelate, of that age, by English authorities alone. It is very easy to manufacture a history, but it is not easy to make facts agree with fabulous events. Although a saint had been made at Rome, on the strength of this story among others, it was only two years afterwards that the *Civilta Cattolica*,* published in the same city, gave the lie to the whole affair, by stating that up to the year 1853, *no bishop of Anglican consecration, while in full possession of his Episcopal character and functions*, had ever made the degrading submission to the Papacy, or joined the Roman communion. Your admired biographer, nevertheless, would have us believe that the Blessed Peter had the good fortune to convert the bishop in question while he was still in the exercise of his office, and enjoyed "a benefice alike honorable and lucrative!" However, as well so as any way when one is writing a romance. The whole story, I am forced to say, is a mere *canard*. The time designated is the epoch of the Great Rebellion, which lasted more than twenty years, and which was attended with the greatest trials to the faith and constancy of the Anglican clergy. Yet John Evelyn has recorded the fact, that during all that time, while so many of the clergy and laity were driven into France, and subjected to Romish arguments, deriving additional consequence from the apparently hopeless overthrow of the Church of England, not five persons of the clerical Order could be counted up, who had been

* Vol. i. II Series, p. 338, Rome, 1853.

tempted to renounce their faith to enter the Roman communion.* In view of the indignities then heaped on them, and of the personal barbarities they suffered, it is certainly to be wondered at, that so few of the English exiles, living at Paris, in constant intercourse with the Gallican clergy, and becoming familiar with their religion, were seduced from their steadfastness.

I am sorry to add, that your author suggests grave doubts as to his ability to write truthfully, almost at every step. Observe the recklessness of his statements as to the dignity of the fabulous ecclesiastic. He is sometimes *Bishop*, and sometimes only *Archdeacon!* True, your biographer never calls him more than *Prelate*, but the Italian *brochure* gives the unequivocal word *Vescovo*, while both agree in confusing these terms with the title of *Archdeacon*, or, in full,—"the Archdeacon of London." Is this a Liguori-like way of insinuating that the Anglican hierarchy admits no distinction in *Orders*, between a bishop and his subordinate clergy; or that a man can be at the same time a bishop and a mere presbyter? Nothing could be more untrue, my Lord, for not only does the Church of England use a scrupulous precision in her titles, in this respect, but, with a fidelity to Scripture and Antiquity which your Church has ventured to dispense with, she affirms the difference between a priest and a bishop to be one of Orders, and of divine institution. The Vatican swarms with a troop of dependents called *Prelati*, who are often mere laymen; and no Romish bishop dares to assert that he is of an Order superior to that of the presbyter. The consequence foreseen by Gregory the Great, when he rebuked his flatterers, is now matter of fact.† He would not be called a "Bishop of bishops," "because," said he, "when you attribute to me more than is my due, you subtract as much from yourself." The Papacy was no sooner established, than it began to repress and abase the Episcopate, in fulfillment of this prediction, to the level of a mere chief-presbyterate. The Abbé Laborde‡ has especially directed attention to the fact that the Pontifical Letter establishing the New Dogma, never recognizes even Roman bishops as veritably *Episcopi*, but

* Evelyn's Memoirs, vol. i, p. 576, London, 1819.

† Epistle xxx, Paris, 1849. ‡ *Relation et Memoire*, p. 70, Note.

merely gives them the equivocal designation of *Prelates*, in severe consistency with their real degradation while attending on a ceremony which was meant to imply, that there is but one bishop, who has a right to be heard, in Christendom. The Church of England, nevertheless, has preserved the Episcopate in all the integrity of the Cyprianic Law, and uses neither words nor things, in such wise as to confound the perceptions and convictions of men, in matters ordained by GOD.

Nothing can exceed the painful jealousy with which Anglicans have guarded this divine Institution. In America, your own Prelates have received consecration from a single consecrator; but no one has ever been acknowledged as a bishop among us, until he had received his Order at the hands of at least three consecrators, for we scrupulously obey the ancient Canon established by the Council of Nice. It may be worth while to add, that although the Sovereign of England is indeed recognized as able to confer temporalities, the Episcopal character is derived from such consecration only; so that no nomination by the Crown, and no election by the faithful, is of any force, till Episcopal consecration is actually conferred. In America, we have no *regale* at all, but we see the injustice of the pretence so often set up, that the *regale*, in England, is something inconsistent with the Episcopate. It is, in fact, nothing more than what your own Bossuet has proved to have been equally claimed and enjoyed by the kings of France.

Granting, then, that Peter Claver did, in fact, convert "the Archdeacon of London," in 1639, it is clear that he did not convert an Anglican bishop. But now, as to even this fact? The members of Clare Hall, in the University of Cambridge, will be surprised to learn that one, who was for so long a time the head of their House, died in the year aforesaid, at Carthagena, a convert to the Jesuit teacher! The name of the Archdeacon was *Thomas Parke*; he accepted that preferment in 1625, and died in 1662, in its full enjoyment. So says veritable history, for which your miracle-loving biographer seems to have a sublime disregard. During a long period, he suffered severely from the Puritans, but bore himself, through all, with consummate patience, and with a constancy the most heroic. Of

his last illness several anecdotes are told, strikingly at variance with the dramatic scene so pathetically given in your friend's book. He was so much beloved, that, while on his death-bed, he was visited in a single day by no less than three Bishops, four members of the Privy Council, two Judges, and three Doctors of Physic, all of whom had been his pupils at the University. I do not find anything in authentic records* which lends support to the assertion that he had also the distinguished honor, and the immense benefit of receiving a visit from the Beatified Peter Claver.

But possibly there is here a mistake. It is not this man, but the *Bishop* of London of whom the biographer of Claver is speaking. Now it is true that the jurisdiction of this Bishop extended beyond seas, and, so far, we find color for the assertion that he was found at Carthagena. But, unfortunately, he who then held the See of London was the celebrated Juxon, whose history, as ordinarily understood, forbids the idea that he died in 1639, or was a convert of the Blessed Peter. On the contrary, we find him, at this epoch, undergoing great trials for the sake of his religion. In the good providence of God, it was his lot, nearly ten years later, to sustain the last moments of his sovereign, King Charles I., to whom he had the satisfaction of administering the Viaticum, and whom he accompanied to the scaffold of his martyrdom. After twelve years more of great vicissitudes, the afflicted Church of England returned to her ancient seats, and Juxon was elevated to the Primacy. Finally, he died Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1663.

Do you suggest that it was probably the predecessor of Juxon in the See of London, and that your friend's biography is slightly at fault, in this matter of date? Well, it is a fact that almost the only formal discussion which history has noted, between an English Bishop and a Jesuit, took place early in this Episcopate, and the Bishop himself was the disputant! So, then, we arrive at the first thing which gives plausibility to your Lordship's conjecture; but in all other respects, there is so remarkable a variance, that I am inclined to think this slight

*See Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 174.; Le Neve's *Fasti*; *Querela Cantab.* etc.

coincidence provides a very slender base for the statue of Blessed Peter Claver to stand upon. We find the scene of the rencounter, not at Carthagena, but at London ; not on board of a ship, but in the Palace Royal ; and the assembly, instead of being composed of ignorant sailors, was made up of scholars and courtiers. The issue, moreover, was widely different from that related in the biography. In recalling what passed in this Conference, the Church of England has no reason to be ashamed, whether we consider her cause, or the manner in which it was sustained. In short, my Lord, the Bishop in question was the renowned Laud, who lived to be Primate of all England, and who died a martyr for the Catholic Faith, as professed in the Church of England. He died on the scaffold, decapitated by the Puritans, in 1645. And I venture to ask your Lordship's attention to the published history of that celebrated Conference,* which has never been answered, in point of the argument for the Church of England. The erudition of the bishop, and the vigor of his logic, had the happy effect of opening the eyes of many persons, of high character and quality. When the Puritans afterward raised againt him the outcry of Popery, he was able to show them a long list of illustrious names, beonging to persons of learning and piety, whom he had succeeded in converting from Romanism, and confirming in the primitive orthodoxy of the Anglican Communion. One fact, the precise reverse of what is narrated in the biography of Peter Claver, deserves to be mentioned; the fact, that a Roman Catholic Bishop, of that age, while in full possession of his benefice, renounced Romanism, and was received into the Church of England. I refer to the celebrated Mark Antony de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, who not only lived a considerable time in possession of an English benefice, and served at our altars, but also united in the propagation of our succession, by joining in the consecration of the Bishop of Lincoln, in the year 1617.

I trust, my Lord, that your love of evidence and of truth, will enable you to rejoice, not only in seeing so many misrepre-

* *A Relation of the Conference between Wm. Laud, &c., &c., and Mr. Fisher, the Jesuit.* Oxford, 1849.

sentations of facts dispelled even at the expense of your friend's narrative, but, further, in observing that I have thus far dealt with only the most trivial and unessential of his inaccuracies. Dropping the Italian *brochure* entirely, I shall confine myself, hereafter, to the work which enjoys the high honor of your Episcopal sanction. This latter goes far beyond the other, in its detail of circumstances, some of which are flagrantly at variance with known and established facts of Ecclesiastical History. The already great differences between Anglicans and Gallicans, need not be exaggerated to be deplored: but, I am happy to assure you that they are greatly less than your author would have us suppose, so far as historical events are concerned.

Your author says of the B. Peter Claver, that "he conferred with the Archdeacon on all the articles of controversy between Catholics and Protestants." This gives two false impressions—(1) that Anglicans are not Catholics, and (2) that they are concerned with the controversies of Protestants in general, and *en masse*. But, my Lord, after three hundred years of suffering between Papists and Puritans, for the sake of preserving undefiled our undoubted Catholicity, you need not be surprised to find us unwilling to be represented as ignoring our Catholic principles, on the one hand, or as permitting ourselves, on the other, to be swamped in the chaos of an inorganic and heterogeneous Protestantism! The distinction between the ancient Church of England, and mere sectaries, has been too often recognized, even by your own writers, to require any further illustration. Bossuet, himself, seems disposed, at times, to pay a just tribute to the Anglican Church; and so deeply sensible was he of her Catholic character, that his own exposition of the Tridentine Creed, is but an effort to reduce the crudities of Pius IV., to something like agreement with her standards. He was convinced, I am well persuaded, that the principles to which he paid such homage, if once accepted from him by the Roman Communion, might be made the precious basis of a re-union among Christians. Yet, even he, at other times, carried away by the desire to demolish all antagonism at a single blow, affects to treat the Church of England as a mere portion of European Protestantism; and he affects to

triumph over her, when he has merely demolished some whim of the Calvinists, to which she has been uniformly opposed, and in behalf of which Calvinists have fought her with fire and sword! His noblest arguments, and his strongest positions against mere Calvinism, or Lutheranism, had all been anticipated by Anglican Divines, and urged with an erudition and steadfastness, at least equal to his own. His great contemporary, Bishop Bull, after long years of Confessorship, in maintaining the truth against Puritans, attracted the admiration and received the homage of the Gallican Clergy, for his immortal testimony against the Jesuits. You surely must remember, my Lord, that noble treatise, the Defence of the Ante-Nicene Faith against the Jesuit Petau, and the magnanimous tribute which Bossuet paid to it, in the name of his brethren! Possibly you may remember the reply which the learned author addressed to Bossuet, touching this very matter of genuine Catholicity. But Bull is only one of a noble army of Anglican Doctors, whom no man can reduce to the level of mere Sectaries. Many are our theologians, who, with learning and powers as great as his, have maintained the Catholic dogmas against both Puritans and Jesuits. Is it not a melancholy evidence of the degrading influences of controversy, to see such an one as "the Eagle of Meaux," stooping to claim a victory, at the expense of justice and truth? To see a spirit, so generous and lofty, condescending to speak of such a Church as that of Bull, and Taylor, and Pearson, as if it were but one of the confused tribes of that Protestantism, the *variations* of which he has so powerfully exposed and castigated! But, the *Nemesis* of Divine Justice has been signally displayed, in the subsequent history of that noble Gallican. The Ultramontanist writers have dealt with him, as he has dealt with us. They affect to regard him as a Jansenist, or even as a mere Protestant. They have refused permission to his townsmen to set up his statue in a sacred place. At the late council of La Rochelle,* it was proposed to *censure* him, by vote, as Wiclif was censured at Constance:

---

* *Observateur Catholique*, No. I. p. 24. Paris, 1855.

κόρακες ὡς
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

e, Wiclif himself never furnished the Church with such
ns against the Papacy as are to be found in the writings
ssuet. He was, on the whole, a good Anglican stranded
) French side of the Channel. But he died imagining
'rance, at least, would revere him. Such is retribution!
ıo condescended to be unjust, has had ingratitude and
ice meted out to him: and he furnishes us a striking
)le of the folly and impolicy of unfair dealing; of the
employing stratagem in those serious discussions, over
Christian candor, if not charity, should extend a sove-
and beneficent influence.

:opose, in my next Letter, to return to the errors which
een propagated in France, with respect to the English
nation; after first examining those which are no less
ily repeated, with respect to the origin of the Church of
nd, and its progress in the early ages of Christianity.

And I remain, My Lord, etc., etc.

MONSIEGNEUR, THE BISHOP OF ARRAS, ETC., ETC.

Art. VII.—PEWS.

We regard the Pew System as a substitute for the an economy, made necessary by the loss of the ancient disci The Reformation, which put an end to the latter, introd Pews. Do we, therefore, condemn the Reformation? I means. But we do say, that it left its work incomplete. plain historical fact, that its own intention was not fulfille matters of government and polity. In some instances, it p down portions of the old fabric, which have never since bee built. Naturally and necessarily, errors in doctrine and co tions in worship engaged its first attention. The restorati primitive discipline was not, however, forgotten. It was la discussed, and even theoretically provided for. But the *exec* failed, (if the word may ever be used of the experience o Church, whose Head is with her always,) by *accident*. I omitted by lapse, not intentionally; and the consequenc been, and is, that, from the Reformation downward to the ent, we have had no law, and still have none, which define duties of the Laity, which subjects, as in early times, every tized person to the active rule of the Church, which secure due and punctual performance of lay obligations to the Bo the Faithful.

Hence arose the system of Pews, a peculiarity (chief the Anglican Communion and of Protestant sects. The M odists have the least of it, because they have most of disci ary control over the Laity. We have least of the latter, therefore, most of the necessity of Pews. The system is, ply, an expedient for providing temporal support to the Cl in her privation of authority. We cannot say, we like th tem. The old was better. But we accept it, nay, we d it, *as a necessity*. We do not know whether a more exc method might not have been devised. For ourself, we rathe fer the mode of annual subscriptions, which, we hear, is comm the South. But Pews we have; and, until we can see thes days converted into primitive times, we are disposed to

the best of what we have. That some extraordinary contrivance is necessary, is, to our mind, as clear as the fact, that we have not, and cannot have for a while, if ever, the original plan. Free Churches may do, for exceptions; but we do not believe in treating exceptions as general rules. There must be some *law;* and as we cannot have, or so long as we do not have, the ancient law, we are content, that men be required to pay for their seats in Church; so that the Ministers of religion, seeing that they are mortal beings, and, therefore, need temporal support, may not fail of subsistence.

We do not seem, then, to have any great respect for Pews. No. But we think, that the indignation expended upon them by our Free Churchmen is aimed at the wrong mark. We would like to see them trying their skill at the decay of primitive discipline. If their courage, or their principles, cannot be elevated to so high an aim, we humbly protest, that it is not generous, or noble, to shoot at the poor agent who is endeavoring, to the best of its ability, to fill the office of its defunct predecessor. One might think, to hear the maledictions of these Free-men, that Pews were an usurper; whereas, they are only a provisional successor, the royal line being extinct. We regard Pews as a necessity for the present distress. They are better than the anarchy of Free-dom, every one doing what is right in his own eyes, and the greater part finding that right to consist in doing nothing. We love law; and we cannot, with honest judgment, object, where the State is abnormal, if the law is abnormal, too. We do not deem it extravagant to affirm, that any law which accomplishes the end of the law, is better than lawlessness; and the Free system is, in the existing condition of things, simply and totally, lawlessness. The language of Pews is somewhat like *this:* As you, laymen, are a people whom the Church of modern times does not pretend to govern, we ask of you security; the security is *Rents.* Our Minister must not starve. But we are not quite sure that he would not, if we should leave him to your *mercy.*

But Pews are not as good as they might be, or as they ought to be. This, indeed, is not peculiar to Pews. It is true of us all. There are evils and abuses connected with the system,

which we cannot but think unnecessary; and it is one of the merits of the Free enterprise, that it has brought out these abuses into strong light. It is, often, a merciful result of extreme aims that, while, from their ultraism, they cannot attain their object, they lessen the evil against which they are directed. The clashing of opposites sometimes brings both to a wiser position, on middle ground. Several of the points of the Free attack on Pews are well chosen, and cannot be gainsayed. One, for example, is irresistible, and denotes the necessity for a reform in the Pew system, which ought to be immediate. We refer to the *selling* of Pews in consecrated buildings. We do not see how this practice can be defended, for a moment. It is, to our mind, monstrous, abominable, sacrilegious. We do not question the clear conscience with which it is done. We do not doubt, that our brethren who practice it, believe they are doing right. We do not charge them with wilful sin in the matter. But we do not see *how* they can reconcile with the idea of Consecration to God subsequent sale to man. These Pews descend by entailment to one's children. They are property in *this* sense, that they can be sold again, exchanged, and bequeathed. The savor of grateful memory gathers around them, as the places where our fathers and mothers worshipped; and they are often, therefore, regarded as precious heir-looms, the dearest treasures of one's human ownership. They are, therefore, property,—man's property. And yet the House, of which they form a part, has been given to God, solemnly consecrated to His use and service, "appropriated" to Him, set apart from all "worldly" uses. Is not the making of it, or of any part of it, human property, a worldly use? Can it be consistent with the act which has just transpired, by which it was given into God's exclusive ownership, made "holy" forever? We do not see how this formidable objection can be removed. We do not hesitate to say, therefore, that Churches in which the Pews are to be sold, ought not to be consecrated. Why should they be? A Congregation whose idea of Consecration allows of the sale of the thing consecrated, cannot have, one would think, any very serious scruples about worshipping in an unconsecrated Church. Let them remain, as some of our

old Colonial Churches still remain, free from the enactment of a solemn scene which is, the next day, to be turned into mockery, by the voice and hammer of the auctioneer.

It is said, that the sale of Pews is necessary to the building of the Church. We do not believe, that it is as often necessary as is supposed. We believe that, in very many cases, subscriptions may be had, as readily, upon the promise, that one shall have a place in the Church to worship in on the payment of the annual assessment. But when it *is* necessary, then let the building remain a place of worship without Consecration, until such time as it can be redeemed from human ownership. Consistency and due reverence for sacred things demand this.

The extreme advocates of Free Churches press their argument too far, when they pretend to see no difference between the selling and the leasing of Pews. The difference is essential and radical. In the one case, it is the conferring of ownership. In the other, it is a permission for temporary use, on condition of contributing so much to the support of the Sanctuary. In the one instance, the principle of Consecration is palpably and grossly violated. In the other, it is not affected. The Holy House is sacred property. From the hour of its Consecration, it belongs to God. The Vestry is the steward, in God's behalf. It has no right to alienate property which does not belong to it, or to the Body which it represents. Its only lawful province is to administer the property, in such wise that the uses to which it is devoted, namely, the various ministrations of religion, may be sustained. This it does, by requiring those who worship there to contribute to its maintenance ; and this is but giving to the Divine Owner a return from what is His own ; since to His glory is devoted the gain by which His holy Service is sustained and perpetuated. The holders of Pews give to Him, for the usufruct of His property. We cannot see any violation of principle in all this. On the contrary, it is in accordance with the universal requisition, by Deity, of return to His honor and glory, for gifts bestowed upon us.

But it is argued, that the *exclusive* use makes a temporary ownership. Such arguing seems to us to be a plain abuse of terms. These same Free Churchmen would not reason thus of

worldly things. No man calls the tenant of his house temporary owner, or owner in any sense; and it only injures the Free cause to push its arguments to such extravagant conclusions. But it is said, the holder has, for the time, as exclusive possession as if he were owner. That may be; but it does not, therefore, follow that he *is* owner; and that is the point of difference upon which we insist. A man may have, by loan, as exclusive a use, while the loan lasts, as if he were owner. Is he, therefore, owner? This favorite argument of the extremists against Pew-leasing cannot stand. It would better be abandoned at once. It is an ebullition of undiscriminating zeal.

But it is wrong, persists the advocate, to give any exclusive use in the House of God. Why do *you* do it, then? we ask. It is common to assign Pews in Free Churches to regular worshippers; and they use them, too, about as exclusively as if they had hired them. We have seen a Free-Churchman turn a stranger out of his Pew, who had pre-occupied it, with as much authority as the same insolence is sometimes practiced with in Pew Churches. And we have often seen regular worshippers resist the entrance of others into their accustomed seats. The fact is, that, in the best-ordered and the best-supported Free Churches, the same Pews are occupied by the same families, with quite as much regularity as in Pew Churches; and, unluckily, boast is often made of this, in reply to the common objection to Free Churches, that families cannot sit together. The Sexton, ordinarily, watches for strangers, and takes care that they do not enter Pews which are generally occupied by habitual worshippers. And this is found necessary to the preservation of the system:—that is to say, to preserve it, it is found necessary to violate it.

Here, we believe, our Free brethren are wholly at fault. Why not take another primitive position, and insist, that it is not necessary, that families should sit together? Why not separate the sexes, as in the primitive Church, as is still done in the majority of Churches under the sway of the Good Church Catholic? Why should families sit together? Is not the Church of God a family? Why introduce into it the distinctions of our natural life? What right is there in the union of

Church and the human Family, any more than of the rch and State? Are we not, all, brothers and sisters, as lren of God by Baptism? What other tie should be re-ized in the Church? We believe, that the Free system, ow practised, is faulty in this respect. Instead of cringing he prejudice, or the habit, which makes people desire to erve family distinctions in the House of God, it should ly assert, as of old, that such distinctions have no proper e there; and, really and literally, receive the Congregation romiscuous mass; thus carrying out thoroughly its own of perfect Freedom, instead of practically violating it by umbing to a popular prejudice. In this case, the reason for separation of the sexes would very soon become apparent. here is another evil connected with the Pew system, which ires reformation; and that is, *the waste of room.* We k it a moderate calculation, that Free Churches accommo- one-third more than Pew Churches of the same size. The rence is of importance where the Congregation is large, and at, with more room, be larger. It should, indeed, be re-bered, on the other hand, that Free Churches do not always ve all that they might, because they allow the occupancy of s by families; and these families do not, generally, like to others than their own members sit with them. The very ng which makes a family desire to sit together, is exclusive rds strangers, even when the family does not fill the Pew. argument, however, even with this partial drawback, is dedly in favor of the Free plan over the Pew. We have wn a Pew Church to be enlarged at the expense of several sand dollars, when it was confessedly large enough to ac-modate all who desired seats, if all the sittings could be oc-ed. A family of two or three persons, holding a Pew which ht receive five or six, excludes a number equal to itself. ome localities, this is a very great evil. In cities generally, ave no Church room to spare. On Christmas-Day, we officiating in a Church which happened to be, for a Pew rch, full. Some fifty persons went away, unable to obtain s. And yet, as we cast our eye over the Congregation, we d discover more than that number of sittings unoccupied.

These things ought not so to be. We esteem it one of the benefits likely to result, which have, in some quarters, already resulted, from the Free Church agitation, that the unchristian selfishness, which sometimes characterizes Pew Churches, will be broken down. There is no reason why it should not depart entirely. We heartily sympathize with the warfare which is now made upon it. It is incapable of just defence; and will, therefore, yield before the progress of enlightened Christian sentiment. It seems to us, that Rectors and Vestries have a high responsibility in the matter. Congregations may be trained to the exhibition of civility and fraternal feeling, as well as to every other good word and work. A little plainness of speech, with gentleness, will instruct a Christian Congregation how it ought to behave itself in the House of God. We of the Clergy ought to take a firm stand against that worldliness of spirit, which would regard a Pew in Church in the same light with a private box at the Opera. The inconsistency of this disposition with the humbleness of mind, the Christian charity and the sense of the Divine Presence which should accompany one when he enters into the Courts of the Lord, may be made so apparent, by a little practical instruction, that we do not believe it would generally be found a difficult task to root out this evil of selfishness, which has fastened itself so deeply on some of our City Congregations. It seems to us to be, chiefly, the fault of the *Clergy*, that it has been allowed to gain such strength and vigor as to give just occasion, in some instances, to the odious name, "fashionable Churches."

We would suggest the following points for the remedy of the evil. First, besides the teaching of which we have spoken, that holders of Pews, who do not need all the sittings, be invited to authorize the Sexton to fill the seats in their Pews which they do not themselves occupy. We know of instances in which this is done. We do not see why it may not be made, in time, a general practice. Secondly, that all seats be regarded as free, which are not occupied when the reading of the Psalms begins. Pews might be let with this condition. Besides obviating the evil upon which we are dwelling, this might help to correct another vicious practice of many Pew Congre-

gations; namely, *coming to Church late.* The contrast between Pew Churches and Free Churches, in this respect, is very marked, and decidedly in favor of the latter. Thirdly, where a family has an unoccupied seat in its Pew, let some respectable poor person be invited to take it. We happen to know of one, we are sorry that we know of *only* one, beautiful example of this kind. A family, of great wealth, in one of our Northern cities, having a superfluous seat, found a poor woman, one dependent wholly on charity, but of good character, and gave the place to her. She is to be seen in it every Sunday; and the neat, though plain, apparel in which she comes to Church, is, also, the gift of the family; which, moreover, provides for her wants at home.

This leads us to a theme of very great importance, viz., *the treatment of the Poor in and by Pew Churches.* We cannot go to the length of denunciation, in which some of the earnest advocates of the Free system indulge on this subject, because we think it excessive and unjust. There is, in fact, a great variety of action in the matter; from Churches like that in which an unsuccessful applicant for a seat published, the next day, a Card in the newspaper, thanking "the Rector, Vestry and Congregation of —— Church, for the liberty which he had enjoyed, of perambulating its aisles a quarter of an hour, in search of a seat, without molestation;" to another, also, in our mind, which has forty Pews, selected in all parts of the building, some of them among the best Pews in the Church, which are reserved from lease, and kept forever free. This Church, probably, offers as many sittings to the Poor as a Free Church could accommodate, consistently with provision for its own expenses; for no Free Church, as we have before shown, (none, we mean, which depends upon the Congregation at large for its support,) can afford to call in the Poor indiscriminately, and fill the greater portion of its sittings with them. The Church to which we refer, is the best specimen of a Pew Church that we know of. It lets Pews enough for the support of the Parish, and throws open all the rest to the Poor; and those thus reserved are equal, in value and position, to those which are leased.

We are disposed to make this our first point: *No Parish should let more Pews than is necessary for its support.* The only justifiable object in Pew-letting, is the support of the Parish; and at the point where that is attained, the leasing should stop. In many Churches, especially in wealthy congregations, this rule would give as many free-sittings to strangers and those unable to hire, as Free Churches, generally, can afford. We do not look upon the other feature of the excellent Parish to which we have alluded, as equally obligatory upon all; because it might, we think, fairly be claimed, that those who sustain the means of grace in the Church, should be allowed to hold the best Pews; and the leasing of the best Pews may be necessary to the support of the Parish. The objurgation hurled so freely against Pew Churches, that the seats in them reserved for the Poor are the most distant from the Chancel, and the worst in situation, may well be mollified by the reflection, that the same feature is apparent in Free Churches; we will not venture to say, for we do not know, in how large a proportion of them, but, certainly, in many within our own knowledge. The best Pews are occupied by those whose offerings are the support of the Parish. The Poor, and especially the *very* Poor, are the least well situated. This arises, moreover, from a cause which is rather commendable than otherwise; the feeling, namely, among the Poor of the Congregation, that as they are supplied with the means of grace through the benefactions of their richer brethren, it is but civil that they should leave to them the most convenient and comfortable places in the Church. This feeling is particularly influential with the best class of Poor, those who have the most of Christian humility, (by no means a universal trait among the Poor,) those who have most propriety of character and behavior, those, in fine, for whom it is most encouraging and most comforting to work.—There is another feeling which leads many of the Poor to the same course. They come to Church, necessarily, in inferior clothing; and they prefer on that account, to be where they shall be least noticed. They are most at ease there. Besides, they bring with them the odors of their close and unwholesome habitations; and therefore, instinctively, keep aloof

from those to whom they imagine their proximity might not be agreeable. We can imagine a sneer at some of these last expressions; but we claim, that few, if any, who read this Article, have dealt more intimately with the Poor, or entered more thoroughly into their character, their habits and their motives, than he who writes it. We feel, that we know them well; and it is the highest joy of our Ministry to serve them well. But we do not believe in the justice, or the charity, of sweeping diatribes against Pew Churches; involving, as they do, in their condemnation, Parishes whose work among the Poor far excels the labor of any Free Church in the land, in the same behalf. We believe, on the contrary, that our duty is, to take the Pew system as, in large part, a necessity for these times; and, having accepted it, to perfect it, by bringing it as near to the primitive plan as our altered circumstances will permit. This position will not satisfy radicalists or inexperienced enthusiasts; but we have strong confidence, that it will commend itself to the mature judgment of the Church. At the same time, we say, most cordially and heartily, that, whenever a Free enterprise can be started with sure prospect of success, then, by all means, let it be undertaken. Let every such opportunity of returning to ancient custom be seized and used. But let its laborers be content with doing their own service to their Master, without oppugning those who follow the modern plan. And if the time shall ever come when we shall have attained a practical sense of our need of many primitive methods which we have suffered to fall into disuse, it may be, that some of us who do not think it wise to ignore the realities of our actual position, will be found, if not in the van, yet toiling cheerfully in the ranks, for the restoration of *all* that bears the stamp of Apostolic authority, and has had the confirmation of long descended use.

We come now to *Mission* Churches, or Chapels, as connected with the treatment of the Poor by Pew Churches. We have no occasion to speak of Missions controlled by *Diocesan* authority. The intended scope of our remarks confines us to the ordinary limits of *parochial* life. We are free to say, that, in cities, especially in large cities, the most perfect system in the-

ory is that, which combines the efforts of all Churchmen, under one rule, with Episcopal sanction and oversight. This is the only plan thoroughly in accordance with the genius of the Church; and therefore is the only one which should be adopted, where it is practicable. But we cannot so far shut our eyes to the existing condition of the Church, as to be blind to the fact, that there is too wide a diversity of opinion among us to allow, everywhere, of the realization of the most Churchly schemes. Baltimore alone, we believe, now exhibits such a system of City Missions, in active vigor; and, if we may judge from distant report, (for we have never been an eye-witness of its operation,) its working may well be a theme for congratulation from brethren who are toiling in other portions of the one great field. But where the same blessed unity of view and feeling does not so largely prevail as in the Diocese of Maryland, the same superior method may not be, at once, attainable; and, in no case, should we wish to check the Christian zeal, which may warm the hearts of brethren in the same Parish, and impel them to any legitimate labors for the Poor within the immediate reach of their influence. Indeed, it would be a sorry plan of City Missions which did not, also, leave Parochial energy unfettered within its narrower sphere. But there are regions of want, and vice, and misery, which no single Pastor can tend and cultivate. These, we think, are the true sphere of City Missions; while, whatever any single Parish may choose to undertake, should be left to its separate culture. Thus may both plans work together in peace and harmony.

Now, it is a fact, somewhat new, (for the movement is of recent date,) that Pew Churches have entered upon a series of labors for the Poor which are growing, day by day, into great importance. We might instance some in Philadelphia and New York. We are told, that they have begun to appear in our Western Cities. Everywhere, they are a feature of the age, novel, at least in the extent to which they are now carried. The grand enterprise of St. George's Church, New York, is an illustration, perhaps the most prominent which yet exists, of our meaning. To such efforts, as deeply affecting the relations of Pew Churches to the Poor, we must, in conclusion, devote a few words of comment.

We are disposed to claim, for these Missions, a larger and freer preaching of the Gospel to the Poor than is, or can be, attained by any Free Church. There is no instance, within our knowledge, of a Free Church, which provides the means of grace for so large a number of poor persons as are embraced within the Mission of any one of ten or twelve Pew Churches that we might mention. Is no account to be taken of such labors, in our estimate of the Pew system? They are capable of great extension. The number of Parishes engaged in them may be multiplied many fold. They prove, that, under the Pew system, as under the Free, the ministrations of religion may be carried to the destitute and the needy. The Minister who, supported by a Pew Church, has gathered around him a large Congregation, composed chiefly of people unable to pay for sittings, is doing a work for the Poor which no Free Church in the land is accomplishing; and that work is the labor of love of a Pew Church. Let us be just, and not attempt to confine the highest grace of Christianity to those who do not lease Pews.

But these grand results, instead of awakening in the breast of the extreme advocate of the Free plan, whose watchword is "The Gospel for the Poor," an emotion of gratitude and joy, because so many of his favorite class are brought within the sound of the Gospel, seem, rather to exasperate him, as if they were a counterfeit of his true coin. He regards such work as a contrivance by which the rich may keep themselves in separation from their poor brethren, and yet relieve their consciences from the charge of neglecting them. The rich and the poor, he says, do not thus meet together. The primitive fraternity of all classes in the same Congregation is not realized. But let us look at the matter according to the real facts in the case. Most of these Pew Churches of which we speak, are so situated that they cannot have, if they would, any considerable number of Poor in them. They are too far removed from the abodes of the Poor to admit of such a possibility. They may provide, and they *ought* to provide, within their own walls, for so many of their own Parishioners as cannot afford to pay for Pews. Every well-regulated Pew Church will do this; and

can do it, if no more Pews are leased than the support of the Parish requires. No Parish Church is bound to provide, within itself, larger accommodations for the Poor than is consistent with its own maintenance. Free Churches, as we have seen, are obliged to limit their charity by the same rule. No more can fairly be demanded of a Pew Church. The exact measure of the argument seems to us to be *this:* The Pew system is much more effectual in securing, from the great body of those who are able to contribute to the support of the Church, the fair proportion of each for the purpose. This being done, it is able to do more for the Poor, even within the Pew Church itself, than can be done by a Free Church, in which, always, a large portion of those who can do much, actually do little, or nothing. It is no fit answer to say, that Pew Churches, generally, do not do it. Some do, many do not. But we are speaking of the *capabilities* of the Pew system; and we say, that so long as the primitive rule and discipline are wanting, Pew Churches may, in themselves, be made to accommodate more of the Poor than Free Churches can, unless the latter do it in one of the exceptional modes which we formerly noted.

But, in many Pew Churches, especially in those which are likely to undertake Missions, there is no occasion, it were useless, to provide numerous places for the Poor; since the Churches are situated where the Poor are not, and where they cannot be induced to come. We say again, (and the position requires no argument,) to bless the Poor, you must go where they are congregated; in vast districts, apart by themselves. In such places, a Free Parish Church, unsupported from without, cannot live. The idea of combining rich and poor, *generally*, in the same Congregation, is simply impracticable; for the very plain reason, that they do not *live* together. It is a necessity, that some Congregations be composed mainly of rich people, because the neighborhood of the Church furnishes no other. If this is an evil, it is one which springs from our civil condition; and, therefore, is one which the Church cannot control. There is no chimera which is a wilder flight of fancy than that which possesses the brains of some of our Free Churchmen,—the imagination, namely, that all orders of men may, always

and everywhere, be fused into the same Congregation; that *every* Church may be made to present an assembly of mingled rich and poor. Bring them together in the same streets, in the same neighborhoods, in the same sections of a city, and such a commixture is practicable; and it is as practicable in a Pew Church as in a Free. But, in every instance, we think, in which a Mission exists as an outgrowth of a Pew Church, this condition is not to be found; and we must believe, that if it *did* exist, the charity which now seeks its objects in remote places, would not forget those of the same kin near at hand.

The system of Parish Missions is yet young; and, doubtless, improvements in the working of them will be introduced as they develop themselves. One obvious point of sound policy with regard to them is, to convert them from the *Missionary* into the *parochial* character, as soon as possible. Indeed, they may sometimes best *begin* as Parishes, though under the fostering care of wealthier Churches. Take a district which has a large population of the middle and poor classes. Let the Churchmen already there be sought out; and, from the most fit of them, a Vestry be organized. This will, at once, impart a life and energy to the enterprize which it cannot, otherwise, have. The people of the district will regard it then as their own work; and they will come up to it with a zest which is hardly to be expected when they are, merely, the recipients of the Missionary charity of a rich Parish at a distance. We suppose the organization to have been effected, however, by the rich Parish; and we suppose the new Parish to be sustained by the benefactions of the same, so far as it is unable to provide for itself; while the organization gives an individual and separate life to the enterprize, and calls out the active effort of the population in their own behalf. It may be necessary, at first, that the Vestry be composed, partly, of members of the mother Church; but, it will be best, that they retire, as soon as men of the region can be found who are capable of filling their places. By this method, also, a special deficiency, which sometimes attends Mission Churches, may be avoided. As *Mission* Churches, they are apt to be regarded, by those of the population who, though in moderate circumstances, are not to

be classed with the Poor, as not intended for *them ;* or, the Missionary character gives them the aspect of mere charity, which the people to whom we allude, such as respectable mechanics, shopkeepers, &c., are not willing to receive; while, as *Parish* Churches, these men might be led to take an active interest and coöperation in them. It is, sometimes, objected to Mission Churches, or Chapels, that their Congregations are made up, too exclusively, of the Poor. The object to be attained, if possible, is to induce people of *every* class within the district, to attend; and this, we think, may best be done by converting them into Parish Churches.

There is another work, which may well attract the attention of Pew Churches, which have large means and few Poor of their own to care for. There may be, in the same city, other Churches, which have small means and many Poor. Why should not the fraternal hand be extended to them ; and if the rich Parish does not undertake a work of its own, why should it not select some such Church as we refer to, and make it the almoner of its benefactions to the Poor, by pouring into its treasury, yearly, a stipulated sum, out of its own abundance? This would be an exhibition of brotherly sympathy, an illustration of our holy communion in the unity of the Church, which would be as full of blessing to the Parish which gives, as to the Parish which takes.

But we begin to be conscious of symptoms of prolixity; although we have, still, much on our mind which it would be a relief to ourself, however it might be a burden to our reader, to say. Let us sum up all with a vision of Dreamland, which yet might prove a waking reality. With our mind's eye, we see a Church, glorious in architecture, a fit Sanctuary, so far as human habitation may be, of Him, Whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain. Its full and glowing round of sacred Service is maintained by the dues of those who are able to give of their substance to the honor of the Lord. They are the pillars, which sustain the goodly structure of Rites and Sacraments and Teaching, the channels of grace and salvation to ruined man. But they do not gather around themselves alone, the foliage and the fruits of the Vine, which, humanly, they

support. Its leaves are for the healing of the nations. Wherever a place offers itself in their Church, in which a brother, not of them, or who, being of their number, cannot contribute, like themselves, to the material support of the Sanctuary, may find an opportunity to worship, that place is at his disposal, whether it is in the Pew of the family, or in the unoccupied and reserved seats, which, so far as the necessary sustainment of the Parish will allow, are kept for the use of the poorer brother and the stranger. The Congregation, in a word, is trained to a large and generous hospitality. No one esteems that, for which he pays the hire, as his own. He is glad to give of it, if he may, to any one who seeks the means of grace before the same Altar with himself. Earthly distinctions are not permitted to control him in the House of God; for, he has learned from him who is over him in the Lord, truly to appreciate the universal brotherhood of the Church.—In the same Church, the offerings of the people are received on every principal occasion of public worship; because they are of the nature of worship, alms with prayers going up, Morning and Evening, incessantly, before God. Out of them are dispensed the various benefactions of Christian charity, to Missions, Hospitals, Homes, to feeble Parishes, to the sick and the needy.—If the Parish has strength sufficient, and a field at hand, it does not satisfy itself with its well-doing to so many of the Poor as may be gathered within the walls of the Parish Church. It plants a scion in some outlying district, which it waters and nurtures to maturity.—The Church of which we dream, is furnished throughout, alike. No part of it has been desecrated by sale to man. As God's Tabernacle, it presents, throughout, the same aspect; for, private fancy cannot indulge in showy and variegated decorations, or luxurious additions, where man has no right of ownership. Furthermore, the Pews have no doors in our Dreamland Church; and for the same reason, since they who hold them do not own them, they must not, therefore, present the exclusive appearance of separate enclosures.—The rich and the poor here meet together, not only by the reserve of sittings for the latter, to the full extent that the ability of the Parish allows, but by the exercise of hospitality by pewholders,

to poor relations it may be, or to others, who are selected as objects of fraternal charity. It may be, here and there, tha poor family occupies an entire Pew, for which some rich brother provides the payment; and such Pews you may see the best parts of the edifice; although rich and poor alike fe that, in the Holy House of God, it were an ignoble pride introduce the thought of worldly distinction, as if any one P were not, as God's own, equal to any other. In this Churc as the rich are not allowed to rest in the selfishness of exclusi use, so the Poor are not encouraged to indulge the equal se ishness of claiming that their seats be as comfortable and co venient as the rest. This were an argument for worldly prid to be indulged by the Poor; as against worldly pride, to indulged by the rich. It were doubtful gain, to overthrow t former by introducing the latter.—Every stranger, who ente the Church, is received with Christian courtesy at the doc and conducted immediately to his place, be it in a hired or a free Pew.—In fine, a Pew Church, ruled by the law of t Christian life, may exhibit, though not the full style of ancie brotherhood, a much nearer approach to it than such Church have commonly reached. Let us, therefore, improve what have. Every step will carry us nearer to the more excelle way of the Original Plan; and that way may the modern Chur more and more earnestly covet, until, at the appointed tim the richness and fulness of her lost inheritance shall be restor to her!*

* *Errata.*—In the Article on Free Churches, in the April Number of this Revie page 124, 14th line from bottom, insert "to be," before "the recognized habit and on page 131, 6th line from bottom, for "Pew," read "Free."

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.*

JOURNAL

OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY AND LAITY,

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

IN A

CONVENTION,

HELD IN

The City of Philadelphia, from Tuesday, September 8th, to Friday, September 18th, 1795.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

From the State of New York.—Rev. John Bisset, Rev. George H. Spierin.

From the State of New Jersey.—Rev. Henry Waddell, Rev. John Croes, Joshua M. Wallace, Esquire.

From the State of Pennsylvania.—Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rev. John Andrews, D. D., Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D., Rev. Robert Blackwell, D. D., Joseph Swift, Esquire, Francis Gurney, Esquire, Mr. J. B. Gilpin, Mr. William Stevenson.

From the State of Delaware.—Rev. Joseph Clarkson, Rev. George Dashiell.

From the State of Maryland.—Rev. Joseph G. J. Bend, Rev. John Coleman, Rev. James Kemp, Rev. Samuel Keene, Samuel Johnson, Esquire, David Kerr, Esquire.

From the State of Virginia.—Rev. Samuel S. M'Croskey, D. D., Robert Andrews, Esquire.

From the State of South Carolina.—Rev. Henry Purcell, D. D.

* Continued from Vol. XIII, p. 162.

JOURNAL

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, *September* 8, 1795.

CLERICAL and Lay Deputies, from the Churches in several of the states, assembled in Christ Church at 10 o'clock, A. M., and not being a sufficient number to enter upon business,

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, *ten o'clock*, A. M.

The members met, and a quorum being formed,

The Rev. Mr. Bisset read prayers.

Resolved, That this house appoint a Secretary who is not a member: Whereupon,

The Rev. James Abercrombie, second assistant minister of Christ Church and St. Peter's, was unanimously chosen.

The deputies then proceeded to the election of a president, when the Rev. Dr. William Smith was unanimously chosen.

Ordered, That Mr. Andrews inform the house of Bishops, that this house is now formed, and ready to proceed to business.

Resolved, That the rules of order, adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the last General Convention, be the rules for the government of this house.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the house of Bishops, that Mr. Swift be appointed to request of the Mayor, the use of two apartments in the City Hall, for the accommodation of the Convention, during their present session.

The house of Bishops having transmitted to this house a message, informing that Bishop Provoost is ready to preach before the Convention, agreeably to the appointment of the last General Convention, and proposing that the delivery of the sermon be postponed to Friday next, in order that sufficient notice may be given.

Resolved, That this house agree to the said proposal, and that the Rev. Mr. Bisset inform the house of Bishops thereof.

Resolved, That Mr. Wallace, the Rev. Mr. Bisset, the Rev. Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Andrews, and the Rev. Dr. Purcell, be a committee to examine the credentials of the members.

Mr. Swift informed the house, that the use of two apartments in the City Hall was granted, agreably to application.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the house of Bishops, that the hours of sitting be from ten to three o'clock.

Adjourned to meet in the City Hall to-morrow at ten o'clock, A. M.

CITY HALL, *Thursday, ten o'clock*, A. M.

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Bend read prayers.

The committee appointed to examine the credentials of the members, reported that the deputies from the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, had produced satisfactory testimonials of their appointment.

That this house will to-morrow go into a committee of the whole on the
› church.
rews presented a proposed canon, to alter canon six of the year 1789,
our of the year 1792, respecting the testimonials necessary to be produced
tes for holy orders.
That the same be referred to the committee of the whole on the state
rch.
was received from the Right Rev. Dr. White, of the house of Bishops, enclo-
y testimonials, respecting the Rev. Dr. Samuel Peters, as Bishop elect of
in the state of Vermont, which were read and ordered to lie on the table.
rews presented a proposed canon to alter canon six, of the year 1792,
the officiating of ministers in the parish, or within the parochial cure of
rgyman, which was read and referred to the committee of the whole on
f the church.
use of Bishops transmitted to this house by their Secretary, a letter
to the Bishops, Clergy and Laity, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in
States of America, in Convention—Philadelphia—accompanied with the
nessage: "The House of Bishops have read the letter from Person Par-
th Carolina, directed to the General Convention, but not finding it of such
s that they can act upon it, they propose to the House of Clerical and Lay
hat such answer be returned, signed by the Presidents of both houses, as
sidents may appear most proper.
er was read, and it was
That this house agree to the proposal contained in the above message.
ed to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *ten o'clock*, A. M.

use met, and adjourned to attend divine service in Christ Church, which
med by the Rev. Mr. Waddell, who read prayers, and the Right Rev. Dr.
who preached the occasional sermon; immediately after which, the House
› the City Hall.
sed canon to prevent a congregation in any diocese or state, from uniting
rch in any other diocese or state, was received from the House of Bish-
ter being read, was referred to the committee of the whole on the state
rch.
rews presented a proposed canon to alter the seventh canon of the year
the 7th canon of the year 1792, concerning the learning of those who are
ned, which was referred to the same committee.
unanimously, That the thanks of this House be given to the Right Rev.
st, for his sermon delivered before the Convention this morning in Christ
d that the Rev. Dr. Blackwell, and Joshua M. Wallace, Esquire, be
to present the thanks of this house, and to request a copy of the sermon
tion.
. Dr. Purcell presented testimonials from the Convention of the state of
lina, relative to the election of the Rev. Robert Smith, D. D. to the office
of the Protestant Episcopal Church in that state, which were read and
lie upon the table.
That the order of the day be postponed till to-morrow.
ntion of the House was called by the Rev. Dr. Andrews, to the conside-

JOURNAL

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, *September* 8, 1795.

CLERICAL and Lay Deputies, from the Churches in several of the states, assembled in Christ Church at 10 o'clock, A. M., and not being a sufficient number to enter upon business,

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, *ten o'clock*, A. M.

The members met, and a quorum being formed,

The Rev. Mr. Bisset read prayers.

Resolved, That this house appoint a Secretary who is not a member: Whereupon,

The Rev. James Abercrombie, second assistant minister of Christ Church and St. Peter's, was unanimously chosen.

The deputies then proceeded to the election of a president, when the Rev. Dr. William Smith was unanimously chosen.

Ordered, That Mr. Andrews inform the house of Bishops, that this house is now formed, and ready to proceed to business.

Resolved, That the rules of order, adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the last General Convention, be the rules for the government of this house.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the house of Bishops, that Mr. Swift be appointed to request of the Mayor, the use of two apartments in the City Hall, for the accommodation of the Convention, during their present session.

The house of Bishops having transmitted to this house a message, informing that Bishop Provoost is ready to preach before the Convention, agreeably to the appointment of the last General Convention, and proposing that the delivery of the sermon be postponed to Friday next, in order that sufficient notice may be given.

Resolved, That this house agree to the said proposal, and that the Rev. Mr. Bisset inform the house of Bishops thereof.

Resolved, That Mr. Wallace, the Rev. Mr. Bisset, the Rev. Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Andrews, and the Rev. Dr. Purcell, be a committee to examine the credentials of the members.

Mr. Swift informed the house, that the use of two apartments in the City Hall was granted, agreably to application.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the house of Bishops, that the hours of sitting be from ten to three o'clock.

Adjourned to meet in the City Hall to-morrow at ten o'clock, A. M.

CITY HALL, *Thursday, ten o'clock*, A. M.

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Bend read prayers.

The committee appointed to examine the credentials of the members, reported, that the deputies from the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, had produced satisfactory testimonials of their appointment.

The House of Bishops also informed this house, that they had examined and approved the testimonials in favor of the Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, Bishop elect of the church in South Carolina, and that they had appointed to-morrow morning as the time for his consecration, at Christ church.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock on Monday Morning.

MONDAY, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Clarkson read prayers.

Dr. Andrews presented a proposed canon to alter canon 3d, of the year 1789, respecting Episcopal visitation, which was read, and ordered to be referred to the committee of the whole on the state of the church.

Mr. Bisset presented a proposed canon to alter the 4th canon of the year 1789, which was read, and ordered to be referred to the same committee.

The house took up the proposed canon concerning the testimonials of those who are to be ordained, which was read and passed.

The proposed canon to regulate the officiating of Ministers in the parish or parochial cure of another Clergyman, was taken up, and the question on the proposed amendment was taken by states, and lost; whereupon an addition to the canon was moved by Mr. Bisset, read, and ordered to be postponed.

A proposed canon, for the better accomplishing of the objects of the 6th canon, of the year 1792, respecting the preaching of Clergymen in different parishes, was received from the House of Bishops, read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The house then resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the order of the day, the Rev. Dr. Blackwell in the chair; and after some time the committee rose, and the chairman reported the following resolution.

Resolved, That the pamphlet entitled "Strictures on the love of power in the Prelacy, by a member of the Protestant Episcopal Association in the state of South Carolina," contains very offensive and censurable matter.

This resolution was adopted by the house.

The committee then asked leave to sit again, which was granted.

The Rev. Mr. Sperrin obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

TUESDAY, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met and the Right Rev. Dr. Madison read prayers.

The proposed canon respecting the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained, was sent to the House of Bishops by the Rev. Mr. Bisset.

Dr. Magaw presented a proposed canon on the preparatory exercises of a candidate for the ministry, which was read, amended, and sent to the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops returned the canon on the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained, with an amendment; which was agreed to, and returned by Mr. Wallace, with an additional amendment, which was concurred in by the House of Bishops.

The proposed canon respecting the officiating of Clergymen, within the parish or parochial cure of another Clergyman, was passed, and transmitted by the Rev. Mr. Bisset to the House of Bishops.

The Rev. Mr. Croes presented a proposed canon, empowering the Bishop in each diocese, to compose a form of prayer or thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The canon, proposed by the House of Bishops, for the better accomplishing of the objects of the 6th canon of the year 1792, was returned to the House of Bishops, with an amendment which was agreed to.

The proposed canon respecting the preparatory exercises of candidates for holy orders, was agreed to, and sent to the House of Bishops, by the Rev. Mr. Bisset.

The house resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the church, the Rev. Dr. Blackwell in the chair.

The committee rose and the chairman reported,

A canon of Episcopal visitation; a canon of the learning of candidates for holy orders; and a canon of the age of those who are to be ordained, or consecrated.

The Rev. Mr. Keene, the Rev. Mr. Kemp, and Mr. Kerr, obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, 9 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Waddell read prayers.

The proposed canon respecting Episcopal visitation was read, passed, and sent by the Rev. Mr. Clarkson, to the House of Bishops.

The proposed canon, respecting the learning of candidates for holy orders, was read, passed, and sent by the Rev. Mr. Bisset to the House of Bishops; also the proposed canon respecting the age of those who are to be ordained.

The Rev. Mr. Bisset presented additional documents respecting the formation of a congregation in Person parish, in the state of North Carolina; which, after being read, were referred to the Presidents of both houses.

The house then resolved itself into a committee of the whole, with a view to determine who was the author of the pamphlet entitled "Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy, by a member of the Protestant Episcopal Association in the state of South Carolina."

While they were engaged in this business, a message came from the House of Bishops which the committee rose to receive, and which is in the following words:

"The House of Bishops propose a conference with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, upon a matter which they are anxious to lay before the house."

The house agreed to the conference, which was immediately gone into, the President of the House of Bishops in the chair.

After some time the conference ended, and the President took the chair.

A paper was laid before the House, concerning the pamphlet entitled, "Strictures on the love of power in the Prelacy," which it was resolved should be referred to a committee of the whole to-morrow.

The House of Bishops returned the canon respecting the learning of those who are to be ordained, with an amendment, which being read, was negatived.

An amendment was also proposed by the House of Bishops, to the canon respecting Episcopal Visitation, which was read and concurred in.

The Bishops returned the canon respecting the age of those who are to be ordained or consecrated, with their concurrence.

The House of Bishops requested a conference, on the canon of the learning of those who are to be ordained.

Ordered, That the Rev. Mr. Bend inform the House of Bishops, that this House agrees to the conference on the proposed canon, respecting the learning of those who are to be ordained.

The conference accordingly took place.

The House of Bishops also informed this house, that they had examined and approved the testimonials in favor of the Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, Bishop elect of the church in South Carolina, and that they had appointed to-morrow morning as the time for his consecration, at Christ church.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock on Monday Morning.

MONDAY, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Clarkson read prayers.

Dr. Andrews presented a proposed canon to alter canon 3d, of the year 1789, respecting Episcopal visitation, which was read, and ordered to be referred to the committee of the whole on the state of the church.

Mr. Bisset presented a proposed canon to alter the 4th canon of the year 1789, which was read, and ordered to be referred to the same committee.

The house took up the proposed canon concerning the testimonials of those who are to be ordained, which was read and passed.

The proposed canon to regulate the officiating of Ministers in the parish or parochial cure of another Clergyman, was taken up, and the question on the proposed amendment was taken by states, and lost; whereupon an addition to the canon was moved by Mr. Bisset, read, and ordered to be postponed.

A proposed canon, for the better accomplishing of the objects of the 6th canon, of the year 1792, respecting the preaching of Clergymen in different parishes, was received from the House of Bishops, read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The house then resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the order of the day, the Rev. Dr. Blackwell in the chair; and after some time the committee rose, and the chairman reported the following resolution.

Resolved, That the pamphlet entitled "Strictures on the love of power in the Prelacy, by a member of the Protestant Episcopal Association in the state of South Carolina," contains very offensive and censurable matter.

This resolution was adopted by the house.

The committee then asked leave to sit again, which was granted.

The Rev. Mr. Sperrin obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

TUESDAY, 10 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met and the Right Rev. Dr. Madison read prayers.

The proposed canon respecting the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained, was sent to the House of Bishops by the Rev. Mr. Bisset.

Dr. Magaw presented a proposed canon on the preparatory exercises of a candidate for the ministry, which was read, amended, and sent to the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops returned the canon on the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained, with an amendment; which was agreed to, and returned by Mr. Wallace, with an additional amendment, which was concurred in by the House of Bishops.

The proposed canon respecting the officiating of Clergymen, within the parish or parochial cure of another Clergyman, was passed, and transmitted by the Rev. Mr. Bisset to the House of Bishops.

The Rev. Mr. Croes presented a proposed canon, empowering the Bishop in each diocese, to compose a form of prayer or thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The canon, proposed by the House of Bishops, for the better accomplishing of the objects of the 6th canon of the year 1792, was returned to the House of Bishops, with an amendment which was agreed to.

The proposed canon respecting the preparatory exercises of candidates for holy orders, was agreed to, and sent to the House of Bishops, by the Rev. Mr. Bisset.

The house resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the church, the Rev. Dr. Blackwell in the chair.

The committee rose and the chairman reported,

A canon of Episcopal visitation; a canon of the learning of candidates for holy orders; and a canon of the age of those who are to be ordained, or consecrated.

The Rev. Mr. Keene, the Rev. Mr. Kemp, and Mr. Kerr, obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, 9 *o'clock, A. M.*

The house met, and the Rev. Mr. Waddell read prayers.

The proposed canon respecting Episcopal visitation was read, passed, and sent by the Rev. Mr. Clarkson, to the House of Bishops.

The proposed canon, respecting the learning of candidates for holy orders, was read, passed, and sent by the Rev. Mr. Bisset to the House of Bishops; also the proposed canon respecting the age of those who are to be ordained.

The Rev. Mr. Bisset presented additional documents respecting the formation of a congregation in Person parish, in the state of North Carolina; which, after being read, were referred to the Presidents of both houses.

The house then resolved itself into a committee of the whole, with a view to determine who was the author of the pamphlet entitled "Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy, by a member of the Protestant Episcopal Association in the state of South Carolina."

While they were engaged in this business, a message came from the House of Bishops which the committee rose to receive, and which is in the following words:

"The House of Bishops propose a conference with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, upon a matter which they are anxious to lay before the house."

The house agreed to the conference, which was immediately gone into, the President of the House of Bishops in the chair.

After some time the conference ended, and the President took the chair.

A paper was laid before the House, concerning the pamphlet entitled, "Strictures on the love of power in the Prelacy," which it was resolved should be referred to a committee of the whole to-morrow.

The House of Bishops returned the canon respecting the learning of those who are to be ordained, with an amendment, which being read, was negatived.

An amendment was also proposed by the House of Bishops, to the canon respecting Episcopal Visitation, which was read and concurred in.

The Bishops returned the canon respecting the age of those who are to be ordained or consecrated, with their concurrence.

The House of Bishops requested a conference, on the canon of the learning of those who are to be ordained.

Ordered, That the Rev. Mr. Bend inform the House of Bishops, that this House agrees to the conference on the proposed canon, respecting the learning of those who are to be ordained.

The conference accordingly took place.

The proposed canon respecting the empowering of the Bishop of each state to impose a form of prayer or thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions, was read, agreed to, and sent to the House of Bishops by the Secretary.

The House of Bishops returned the said canon with their concurrence.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this House be presented to the Rev. Dr. Smith, for his sermon delivered at the consecration of the Right Reverend Dr. Robert Smith; and that he be desired to furnish a copy of the same to be printed.

The canon respecting the preparatory exercises of a candidate for the ministry, as returned by the House of Bishops with amendments, which were adopted.

Adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY, *nine o'clock*, A. M.

The House met, and the Rev. Mr. Croes read prayers.

Dr. Andrews proposed an amendment of an amendment proposed by the House of Bishops on the proposed canon respecting the learning of those who are to be ordained, and the question being taken by states, was agreed to, and sent to the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops returned the said canon with their concurrence.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Magaw,

Resolved, That a committee be appointed, consisting of four members, who (in concurrence with a committee of the House of Bishops, if they shall appoint such committee, and independently of what relates to the printing of the minutes) shall arrange the canons, and principal papers belonging to the Convention, causing them to be fairly transcribed in a proper bound book, in order that they may be faithfully preserved for the perpetual use of the Houses of the General Convention of this Church, to recur to, as occasion may require; and the said committee may, if they think proper, employ a clerk, or transcriber, to be paid out of such monies as may be provided, for defraying the necessary incidental expenses of Convention.

Thereupon,

Resolved, That the President of this House, the Rev. Dr. Andrews, the Rev. Dr. Magaw, and the Rev. Dr. Blackwell, be the members of the above committee, and that the Rev. Mr. Bisset, the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the last General Convention, be requested to collect and deliver to the said committee, all the documents belonging to the Convention, which may be in his hands, and to assist the committee in the execution of their duties as far as may be in his power.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing this House that they had concurred in the above resolve, and appointed Bishop White on their part.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the paper referred to them yesterday, and on other business referred to them.

The committee rose, and their chairman reported, that they had considered the paper referred to them yesterday, which was from the author of the pamphlet entitled, "Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy," in which he professes his sorrow for the publication, and that they were of opinion the House should accept it as a satisfactory concession.

Resolved, That the House adopt the above report.

The committee also reported certain canons and resolutions, without amendment.

Ordered, That the paper referred to in the report, be carried by the Rev. Mr. Bisset to the House of Bishops.

The following message was received from the House of Bishops:

"The Bishops request the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to appoint a committee, to confer with a committee of their House on a subject which has been already before them."

A committee of five was accordingly appointed, viz. the Rev. Dr. Andrews, the Rev. Mr. Bend, the Rev. Mr. Waddell, Colonel Gurney and Mr. Johnson; who at the request of the House of Bishops, repaired to their chamber, and on their return made a report, referring to some alterations which may be proper in the minutes, in consequence of the concession made by the author of the pamphlet, entitled, "Strictures on the Love of Power in the Prelacy," which was agreed to.

Adjourned till nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *nine o'clock*, A. M.

The House met, and the Rev. Dr. Purcell read prayers.

The canon entitled a canon to prevent a congregation in any diocese or state, to unite with the church in any other diocese or state, which was proposed by the House of Bishops, was read, amended, and being sent to the House of Bishops, was returned with their concurrence.

Resolved, That the testimonials from the state of Vermont, respecting the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Peters, sent by the House of Bishops, be returned to them, with a request, that they will answer it in whatever manner they shall think best.

The message from the House of Bishops respecting the articles of religion, was read and concurred in.

The following resolve was sent by the Rev. Dr. Andrews to the House of Bishops, and returned with their concurrence:

Resolved, That it be earnestly reccommended to the churches in the several states, not to fail to send deputies to the next General Convention, as it appears inexpedient, that the consideration of the articles of religion should be postponed beyond the period of that meeting.

The Secretary of the committee for carrying into effect the act for supporting Missionaries to preach the gospel on the Frontiers of the United States, reported to this House, the progress made by said committee in the execution of the business entrusted to them—whereupon,

Resolved, That it be recommended to the different State Conventions, to continue either by an annual sermon, or by soliciting private contributions, to provide for the establishment of Missionaries to preach the gospel on the frontiers of the United States; and that instead of committing the general management of the fund, as by the act of the last General Convention, to a standing committee of any state, the Convention of each state shall appoint such committee to have the management of the money contributed in that state, and the application of the same to the support of a Missionary or Missionaries in such part of the United States as they may think proper; and the money heretofore collected in any state, and remitted to the treasurer of the former standing committee, shall be returned to such state committees, when they are appointed, and shall call for the same.

The act past on this subject in the year 1792, is hereby rescinded.

Resolved, That a committee of both Houses be appointed to digest, and report to the next General Convention a course of study for candidates for holy orders, and that the following gentlemen be appointed by this House:—The Rev. Dr. Moore

e Rev. Dr. Andrews, the Rev. Dr. Magaw, the Rev. Dr. Smith, and the Rev. Mr. nd.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the House of Bishops, that it be made known the several State Conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine in next General Convention, on the following addition to the second article of the stitution, in the 9th line, after the word "Convention," viz:

"But if the church shall not be represented in both orders in a majority of the tes, then the vote shall be given by states without regard to orders."

Resolved unanimously, With the concurrence of the House of Bishops, that the nks of this Convention be given to Matthew Clarkson, Esquire, Mayor of the city, the use of the City Hall, and that Colonel Gurney and Joseph Swift, Esquire, be mmittee to communicate the same.

Resolved, With the concurrence of the House of Bishops, that eight hundred copies the Journals be printed.

he House proceeded to appoint a standing committee,* and the following gen- nen were chosen:

or New Hampshire, The Hon. Mr Livermore.

or Massachusetts, The Rev. Dr. Parker.

or Rhode Island, The Rev. William Smith.

or Connecticut, The Rev. Mr. Baldwin.

or New York, The Rev. Dr. Moore, the Rev. Dr. Beach, Robert Watts, Esq.

or New Jersey, The Rev. Mr. Waddell, the Rev. Mr. Croes, Joshua M. Wallace, .

or Pennsylvania, The Rev. Dr. Magaw, The Rev. Dr. Blackwell, the Rev. Dr. drews, Colonel Gurney, Joseph Swift, Esq., Mr. J. B. Gilpin.

or Delaware, The Rev. Mr. Clarkson, the Rev. Mr. Clay, Nicholas Ridgley, Esq.

or Maryland, The Rev. Mr. Bend, Samuel Johnson, Esq., General Lloyd.

or Virginia, The Rev. Dr. M'Croskey, Robert Andrews, Esq.

or South Carolina, The Rev. Mr. Frost, Rev. Dr. Purcell, the Hon. William Smith.

rdered, That the President of this house is chairman of the above committee, is empowered to call together the members.

Resolved, That the thanks of this house be given to the President for his able impartial management in his place, and to the Secretary, for his correct atten- n and services.

Resolved, That the next meeting of the General Convention be held in the city of ladelphia.

he house rose.

WILLIAM SMITH, President.

JAMES ABERCROMBIE, Secretary.

---

*For the powers and duties of the standing committee, see page 11 of the Jour- l of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in Convention, Sept. 1789.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

PHILADELPHIA, *September* 8, 1795.

The [illegible] meeting of the General Convention of the Protestant [illegible] Rev. Bishop White presided, in Christ Church.

In the Vestry Room of Christ Church.

WEDNESDAY, *Sept.* 9.

The house met present,

The Rt. Rev. Bishop White, of the State of Pennsylvania, who, by the rules of [illegible] the last meeting, presided.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Provoost, of the State of New York.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Madison, of the state of Virginia.

The Rev. Joseph Turner was chosen Secretary.

The house received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, informing them, that their house was formed, and ready to proceed to business.

The house received another message informing them, that the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies propose to this house, the adjourning to the City Hall.

The proposal for removing is agreed to.

This house then sent a message to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, informing them, that Bishop Provoost is ready to preach before the Convention, agreeably to the appointment of the last Convention, and proposing Friday next, as the time for the delivery of the sermon.

Information was received that the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies concurred.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, proposing that the hours of sitting of the Convention, shall be from 10 in the morning to 3 in the afternoon, with which this house concurred.

Resolved, That during the session of the Convention, the house will attend divine service, in the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

Adjourned to meet to-morrow morning in the City Hall.

CITY HALL, *Thursday, September* 10.

The house met, present,

The Right Rev. Bishop White, President,
Right Rev. Bishop Provoost,
Right Rev. Bishop Madison,
Right Rev. Bishop Claggett.

The Rev. Mr. Bisset presented to this house, from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, an application from the vestry of the Protestant Episcopal church in [illegible] county, North Carolina.

The house resolved, That it be proposed to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that as the said letter cannot be acted on by the Convention, the Presidents of the two houses be desired to send such an answer to the same, as in their judgments shall be proper.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY MORNING, 10 *o'clock.*

The house met present as yesterday.

This house proceeded, with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to Christ

hurch, where the Rev. Mr. Waddell read prayers; after which the Right Rev. Bishop rovoost delivered a sermon suited to the occasion of the present meeting, as ppointed at the last Convention.

After divine service this house returned to the City Hall, and entered upon busiess.

Resolved, That the thanks of this house be given to the Right Rev. Bishop Provoost for his sermon delivered this morning, and that he be desired to furnish a copy of it for the press.

This house originated a canon and sent it to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, restricting any individual congregation from associating with the church of any other diocese or state, than that in which they are situated.

The house then adjourned.

SATURDAY MORNING, 10 *o'clock.*

The house met, present as yesterday.

This house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, the testimonials f the Rev. Robert Smith, D. D., Bishop elect of this church in the state of South arolina.

A message was sent from this house to the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, forming them, that they had examined and approved the testimonials of the Rev. r. Smith of South Carolina, and that the consecration will take place to-morrow orning in Christ Church.

The following message was sent from this house to the House of Clerical and Lay puties: Whereas the present Convention, from particular unavoidable circumnces, is deprived of many of its members;

Resolved, That this house propose to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to fer the discussion of the articles, until the meeting of the next General Convention, ien a more full representation of this church may be expected.

The following message was also sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, viz: This house took into consideration a resolution of the House of Clerical and Lay puties, in a preceding Convention which resolution is in these words.

Resolved, There be made known to the several state Conventions, that it is pposed to consider and determine in the next General Convention, on the propriety investing the House of Bishops with a full negative upon the proceedings of the her house.

Thereupon Resolved, That the following message be sent to the House of Clerical d Lay Deputies, viz. The House of Bishops have not expressed their sense in any rmer Convention, upon the subject aforesaid: But they now propose to the House Clerical and Lay Deputies, that the legislative power of the House of Bishops all remain as fixed by the third article of the constitution of this church.

The house then adjourned to Monday, 10 o'clock.

MONDAY MORNING, *Sept.* 14.

The house met, present as on Saturday.

The Right Rev. Dr. Smith, who had been yesterday consecrated Bishop of this hurch in South Carolina, took his seat in this house.

A proposed canon was sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, intended o accomplish more fully the object of the sixth canon passed in Convention in 1792.

The Right Rev. Bishop Claggett obtained leave of absence.

The house then adjourned.

TUESDAY MORNING.

The house met, present as yesterday, except Bishop Claggett.

This house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a proposed canon respecting the testimonials of those who are to be ordained.

This house returned the above proposed canon to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with an amendment.

The same canon was again presented to this house with an amendment from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with which this house concurred.

This house received a proposed canon from the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, on the preparatory exercises of the candidates for the ministry.

This house returned the same with amendments.

The proposed canon that originated in this house, for the more full accomplishing of the object of the sixth canon of 1792, which had been sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, was returned to this house with an amendment.

The proposed canon respecting preparatory exercises of candidates for the ministry, was returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies with an amendment.

The house then adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, 9 *o'clock.*

The house met, present as yesterday.

A message was sent from this house to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, desiring a conference with their House upon a matter which they are desirous to lay before them.

A conference was agreed to, and the House of Bishops met the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the chamber of the latter: when the President, by desire, took the chair.

The conference being ended, this house returned to their chamber.

This house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, their concurrence with the amendment to the proposed canon, respecting exercises to be required of persons who are to be ordained.

Resolved, That the said canon now pass and be returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

This house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a proposed canon concerning the learning of those who are to be ordained.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a proposed canon to alter the 3d canon of 1789, on Episcopal visitations.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a proposed canon to alter the canon concerning the age of persons to be ordained.

This House returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, their proposed canon concerning the learning of persons to be ordained, with an amendment, and also the proposed canon to alter the 3d canon of 1789, with an amendment.

This House passed the proposed canon to alter the canon respecting the age of persons to be ordained.

This House passed the canon to alter the 6th canon of 1792, of officiating in the parishes or parochial cures of other ministers.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies signified their non-concurrence with the amendment of the proposed canon, concerning the learning of persons to be ordained.

Resolved, That a conference be requested on the said proposed canon, at such hour as the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies may appoint.

This House received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies informing that they agreed to the conference.

The two Houses then went into conference, and after some time spent therein, this House returned to their chamber.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies a proposed canon, authorising the Bishop of any diocese to appoint forms of prayer or thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions; which was passed and returned.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this House be presented to the Rev. Dr. William Smith, for his sermon delivered in Christ Church, at the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Robert Smith; and that he be requested to furnish a copy of the same to be printed.

The Right Rev. Bishop Madison obtained leave of absence.

This House then adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY MORNING, *nine o'clock.*

The House met: present, as yesterday, except the Right Rev. Bishop Madison.

This House returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, the proposed canon of the learning of persons to be ordained, with an amendment.

The above proposed canon was returned to the House with an amendment, with which this House concurred.

This House received a resolution from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, for the appointing of a committee, for the arrangement of the canons and other papers belonging to this Convention, desiring the concurrence of this House.

This House concurred in the same.

This House requested the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to appoint a committee of their House to meet a committee of the House of Bishops.

The committee of this House is, Bishop White and Bishop Provoost.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies agreed to the request of this House, and a joint committee met in the Bishops' chamber.

This being done, the House returned to their chamber.

A message came to this House from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that they had agreed to the report of the joint committee with a small amendment, which was agreed to.

Bishop Provoost obtained leave of absence.

The House then adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY MORNING, 9 *o'clock.*

The House met: present, the Right Rev. Bishop White and the Right Rev. Bishop Smith.

There was returned to this House the proposed canon from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, to prevent any church from uniting themselves to any other diocese, than to that in the state in which they belong, with an amendment to the said canon; which amendment was agreed to, and the canon passed.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, papers respecting the election of Dr. Peters to be Bishop in the state of Vermont.

The President of this House is desired to give such an answer as the nature of the case requires, and particularly to mention in the said answer, that the Bishops cannot with propriety consecrate a Bishop for the church in any state, until such church shall have acceded to the general ecclesiastical constitution of the church in the United States.

This House received a resolution from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputie proposing that the moneys collected for the purpose of sending Missionaries to t frontiers, be returned to the churches in the states in which they were respective collected; and proposing, that the object of the institution be pursued by t churches in the individual states, with which this House agreed.

This House received a proposed constitutional alteration of the manner of voti in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; in which this House concurred.

This House received a resolution from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputi to appoint a committee that may digest and report to the next Convention, a cou of studies for candidates for holy orders, in which this House concurred, and t Right Rev. Bishop White, Bishop Provoost and Bishop Madison, are the committ from this House for the above purpose.

The House of Bishops concurred with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies thanks to the Mayor of the city, for the use of the hall.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies inform this House, that 800 copies of t Journals of this Convention, are proposed to be printed, which was agreed to.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies sent a message to this House, expressi their intention of rising; and that they had appointed Philadelphia for the place meeting of the next General Convention.

The thanks of the House of Bishops were given to the Rev. Joseph Turner, f his services as Secretary.

Signed by order of the House,

WILLIAM WHITE, Presiding Bishop.

Attest. Joseph Turner, Secretary.

The Certificate of the Consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop Smith, is as follows:

KNOW all men by these presents, that we, William White, D. D., Bishop of t Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Pennsylvania, presiding Bishop; Sam Provoost, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of N York; James Madison, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the st of Virginia; and Thomas John Claggett, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episco Church in the state of Maryland, under the protection of Almighty God, in Chr Church, in the city of Philadelphia, on Sunday, the thirteenth day of September, the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety-five, did then a there rightly and canonically consecrate our beloved in Christ, Robert Smith, D. Provost of Charleston College, and Rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston, in t state of South Carolina, of whose sufficiency in good learning, soundness in the fa and purity of manners we were fully ascertained, into the office of Bishop of t Protestant Episcopal Church in the said state, to which the said Robert Smith h been elected by the Convention of the said state.

In testimony whereof, we have signed our names, and caused our seals to affixed. Given in the city of Philadelphia, this fourteenth day of September, in t year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety-five.

WILLIAM WHITE, (L. S.)
SAMUEL PROVOOST, (L. S.)
JAMES MADISON, (L. S.)
THOMAS JOHN CLAGGETT, (L. S.)

APPENDIX.

CANONS.

CANON I.—*Of Episcopal Visitation.*

EVERY Bishop in this church shall visit the churches within his diocese or trict, for the purpose of examining the state of his church, inspecting the beha- or of the clergy, and administering the apostolic rite of confirmation. And it is med proper, that such visitations be made once in three years at least, by every hop to every church within his diocese or district, which shall make provision defraying the necessary expenses of the Bishop at such visitation. And it is reby declared to be the duty of the minister and vestry of every church or congre- tion, to make such provision accordingly.

The Bishop of any diocese or state district, may, on the invitation of the Conven- n or standing committee of the church in any state where there is not a Bishop, it and perform the Episcopal offices in that state, or part of the state, as the case y be, provision being made for defraying his expenses as aforesaid: and such te, or part of a state, shall be considered as annexed to the district or diocese of h Bishop, until a Bishop is duly elected and consecrated for such state, or until invitation given by the Convention or standing committee be revoked. But it to be understood, that to enable the Bishop to make the aforesaid visitations, it ll be the duty of the clergy, in such reasonable rotation as may be devised, to ciate for him in any parochial duties which belong to him. And no state shall ceed to the election or appointment of a Bishop, unless there be at least six sbyters residing and officiating therein, a majority of whom, at least, shall concur uch election. But the Conventions of two or more states, having together nine more settled and officiating Presbyters, may associate, and join in the election of Bishop.

The third canon of the year 1789 is hereby rescinded.

CANON II.—*Of the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained.*

Every Candidate for holy orders, shall be recommended to the Bishop by a standing mittee appointed by the Convention of the church in that state wherein he sides, which recommendation shall be signed by the names of a majority of the mittee, and shall be in the following words:

"We whose names are here underwritten, testify, that A. B. hath laid before us tisfactory testimonials, that for the space of three years last past, he hath lived piously, soberly, and honestly; and hath not written, taught, or held any thing ntrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church: And reover, we think him a person worthy to be admitted to the sacred order of ———. In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands this ——— day of ——— in the year of our Lord ———."

But before a standing committee in any state shall proceed to recommend any ndidate, as aforesaid, to the Bishop, such candidate shall produce from the minister nd vestry of the parish where he resides, or from the vestry alone, if the parish be rsent, or if there be no vestry, from at least twelve respectable persons of the

Protestant Episcopal Church, of the neighbourhood in which he resides, testimonials of his good morals and orderly conduct for three years last past, and that he has not, so far as they know and believe, written, taught, or held any thing contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church: a publication of his intention to apply for holy orders having been previously made by such minister or vestry. He shall also lay before the standing committee, testimonials to the same effect, signed by at least one respectable clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, from his personal knowledge of the candidate for at least one year.

In every state in which there is no standing committee, such committee shall be appointed at its next ensuing Convention; and in the mean time, every candidate for holy orders shall be recommended according to the regulations or usage of the church in each state, and the requisitions of the Bishop to whom he applies.

The 6th canon, passed in October 1789, concerning the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained, and so much of the 4th canon passed in 1792, as relates to the subject of this canon, are hereby rescinded.

CANON III.—*Of the age of those who are to be Ordained or Consecrated.*

Deacon's orders shall not be conferred on any person until he shall be twenty-one years old, nor Priest's orders on any one until he shall be twenty-four years old, and unless he shall have been a Deacon one year. No man shall be consecrated a Bishop of this church, until he shall be thirty years old.

The 4th canon of the year 1789 is hereby rescinded.

CANON IV.—*Of the learning of those who are to be Ordained.*

No person shall be ordained in this church, until he shall have satisfied the Bishop and the two Presbyters by whom he shall be examined, that he is well acquainted with the holy scriptures, can read the New Testament in the original Greek, and give an account of his faith in the Latin tongue; and that he hath a competent knowledge of natural and moral philosophy and church history, and hath paid attention to composition and pulpit eloquence, as means of giving additional efficacy to his labours; unless the Bishop shall judge it proper to dispense with the above requisites in part, in consideration of certain other qualifications in the candidate peculiarly fitting him for the gospel ministry.

The 7th canon of the year 1789 is hereby rescinded.

CANON V.—*Of the officiating of Ministers of this Church, in the Churches or within the Parochial Cures of other Clergymen.*

No clergyman belonging to this church shall officiate, either by preaching or reading prayers, in the parish, or within the parochial cure of another clergyman, unless he have received express permission for that purpose from the minister of the parish or cure, or in his absence, from the church wardens and vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation. But, if any minister of a church shall, from inability, or any other cause, neglect to perform the regular services to his congregation, and shall refuse his consent to any other minister of this church to officiate within his cure, the church wardens, vestrymen, or trustees of such congregation shall, on proof of such neglect and refusal before the Bishop of the diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, before the standing committee, or before such persons as may be deputed by him or them, or before such persons as may be, by the regulations

of this church in any state, vested with the power of hearing, and deciding on complaints against clergymen, have power to open the doors of their churches to any regular minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The 6th canon of 1792 is hereby rescinded.

CANON VI.—*Of the preparatory exercises of a Candidate for the Ministry.*

Every candidate for the ministry shall give notice of his intention to the Bishop, or to such body as the church in the state in which the candidate resides, may have appointed to superintend the instruction of candidates for holy orders, at least one year before his ordination. And if there be a Bishop within the state or district where the candidate resides, he shall apply to no other Bishop for ordination, without the permission of the former. And the said candidate shall pass through the preparatory exercises which the Bishop, or such body aforesaid, may appoint; such as composing of theses, homilies or sermons, one or more, to be delivered, either publicly or privately, in his or their presence, at such time or times as may be appointed by the authority aforesaid.

And this canon shall be in force from and after the first day of January next.

CANON VII.—*For the better accomplishing of the objects of the sixth Canon of* 1792.

Whereas there is no provision made in the 6th canon of 1792, for the case of such vicinity of two or more churches, as that there can be no local boundaries drawn between their respective cures, it is hereby ordained, that in every such case, no minister of this church, other than the parochial clergy of the said cures, shall preach within the common limits of the same, in any other place than in one of the churches thereof, without the consent of the major number of the parochial clergy of the said churches.

CANON VIII.—*To prevent a Congregation in any Diocese or State to unite with a Church in any other Diocese or State.*

Whereas a question may arise, whether a congregation within the diocese of any Bishop, or within any state in which there is not yet any Bishop settled, may unite themselves with the church in any other diocese or state; it is hereby determined and declared, that all such unions shall be considered as irregular and void; and that every congregation of this church shall be considered as belonging to the body of the church of the diocese, or of the state, within the limits of which they dwell; or within which there is seated a church to which they belong. And no clergyman, having a parish or cure in more than one state, shall have a seat in the Convention of any state, other than that in which he resides.

CANON IX.—*To empower the Bishop in each Diocese or district to compose forms of prayer or thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions.*

The Bishop of each diocese or district may compose forms of prayer or Thanksgiving, as the case may require, for extraordinary occasions, and transmit them to each clergyman within his diocese or district, whose duty it shall be to use such forms in his church, on such occasions. And the Clergy in those states, in which there is no Bishop, may use the forms of prayer or thanksgiving composed by the Bishop of any other state.

Done in Convention, and signed by order of the House of Bishops,

WILLIAM WHITE, D. D., Presiding Bishop.

WILLIAM SMITH, D. D., President of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE LIFE OF DANIEL WILSON, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India. By JOSIAH BATEMAN, M.A., Rector of North Cray, Kent; with Portraits, Map and Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 8vo. pp. 738.

The life of Bishop Wilson, who for a quarter of a century has filled so large a place in the eye and heart of the Christian world, and elaborately written by his Son-in-Law, cannot but be a most attractive work. The Mother Church has shown her wisdom in the character of the men whom she has sent forth to head and lead on the Sacramental host in India. Middleton and Heber would have graced and adorned the Church in any age. James and Turner, though they died before their work was fairly begun, both left their mark for Christ. And Wilson, in the twenty-five years of his Episcopate, lived to labor effectually and nobly for the firm establishment of the Church of Christ in a land, and among a people, where now great things may fairly be expected. Bishop Wilson, the son of a silk manufacturer, was born in London, July 2nd, 1778. He entered Oxford University in 1798, where he won distinction as a scholar. In 1801 he became Curate of the Rev. Richard Cecil in a small agricultural parish in Surrey. In 1803 he became Tutor in his College St. Edmund's Hall, and Curate of Worton. In 1808 he became assistant, and in 1812, sole Minister of St. John's Church, Bedford Row, London; and here he earned his high reputation as a preacher. His pains-taking in sermon writing is worthy of special note; six or seven of his discourses, taken at random, contain extracts from, or references to *fifty-nine* different authorities; a fact for those whose slip shod discourses, written at random, are spun out of their own empty brains. In 1824 he became Vicar of Islington, where he found one Church and one Chapel-of ease, and where after eight years he left three new Churches. We have a right to feel some surprise to find him in 1832, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, *offering himself* to Mr. Grant, the President of the Board of Control, for the See of Calcutta then vacant. This vast Diocese then included not only India, but Australia and New Zealand; where there are now we believe nearly twenty Dioceses, several of them large and important; and all this in the short space of twenty-eight years! We have no space and no disposition, here, to enter into an examination of his doctrinal opinions, or to discuss some points in his official administration, where exception might be taken; it is a more grateful duty to bear witness to his ardent piety, his apostolic zeal, his munificent liberality, and to the large measure of success with which God crowned his arduous labors. We will say, however, that Bishop Wilson is not to be ranked in either of those parties into which English and American Churchmen are now regarded as divided. His character was shaped somewhat by the age in which he lived. Undoubtedly in the awakening of the English Church from the Erastian deadness which a century ago, under the Georges, crept over and paralyzed her, there was a strong infusion of the Calvinistic element. Unfortunately too, much of the true and better life and power of the Church at that period was drawn off into another channel, and became the source of what has since proved the Wesleyan schism, both in the Old world and the New. Unlike Heber

Bishop Wilson in early life drank in the Calvinistic theology; and yet in his private and public character, and in his official conduct, there was a Catholic conservatism and a sturdy unflinching loyalty to the Church which cannot be ignored without doing him great injustice. A comparison between Bishop Wilson and Bishop Heber would be a delightful subject for an Article in the Review, which we should like to see wrought out.

He died at Calcutta, Jan. 2nd, 1858, at the ripe old age of eighty years. The volume before us is full of incident, is exceedingly suggestive, and cannot fail to be useful.

THE PATH WHICH LED A PROTESTANT LAWYER TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By PETER H. BURNETT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860. 8vo. pp. 741.

From the strong commendation of this work of Judge Burnett in several of the Romish periodicals, we were prepared at least to see a formidable presentation of the claims of the Romish Church. And as its author is a Lawyer, and hence accustomed to the business of weighing evidence, we felt some curiosity to see by what process he would meet certain difficulties in the case which he has taken upon himself to plead. We have examined his argument as presented in his large and closely filled octavo; and we beg to assure him that we do not believe there is a single well-read Churchman in this country, who is not capable of detecting, 1st, the utter fallacy of his reasoning; and 2nd, who would not point out at once the real difficulties in his subject, which in his examination, he has not even approached. We have not in a long time seen a book whose pretentiousness tempts us so strongly to give it a thorough sifting. But Churchmen do not need it, and those who will be staggered by this "Lawyer," would not see what we might take occasion to write. The history of the book and of the writer is briefly this. He was born of Baptist parents; up to the age of thirty-three he was a Deist; he was then "converted," joined a sect of Baptists called "Disciples," and participated in those scenes of wild sensuous emotionalism, so common, and so powerful withal, among the Sects at the West. At the age of thirty-five he removed to Oregon, and for the first time in his life attended Romish High Mass at midnight, on a Christmas Festival at Fort Vancouver, where he found the excitement even greater than at a Baptist Meeting. He says, "In all my religious experience I had never felt an impulse so profound, so touching. * * I gazed into the faces of the worshippers, and they appeared as if they were actually looking at the Lord Jesus; and were hushed into perfect stillness in His awful presence." The scene at that midnight Romish Mass seems to have gone a long way in the work of his conversion; for the excitement is the very same in its nature as that gotten up at a Baptist Camp Meeting, and the two Systems are vastly more like each other than the author even now supposes. At this critical point in his history, he fell in with the published "Debates" between the famous Baptist, Mr. Campbell, and the Romish Bishop, Purcell, of Cincinnati, in which the Romanist proved much the stronger combatant of the two. For, while a Romanist does not fear a controversy with a Baptist, yet, as is well remembered, such a man as Archbishop Kenrick was very careful to avoid an open issue with our own Bishop Hopkins a few years ago. But the "Debate" between Bishop Purcell and Mr. Campbell, and such other works as he could lay hands on, all of them second-hand authorities too, judging from his quotations,—setttled the question with this "Protestant Lawyer;" and having be-

come a convert, he now turns author and advocate. His book is a prolonged and at times extremely faint and feeble reëcho of the argument of Bishop Purcell. His blows are directed throughout his whole book, at the positions of the most Ultra Protestantism; while in his defense of what he terms the "Catholic theory," he has not even alluded to the primary, radical, fatal defects of the system: nor only this, but, in as far as he does go, the method of argument which he adopts, is one which no thoroughly educated and shrewd Romanist, at the present day, ever thinks of using, or would ever dare use. Thus his argument for, and defense of, "the unwritten Law of Christ" or Tradition, may be a very good argument as against the Baptists; but this once "Protestant Lawyer" may yet have wisdom to see that a truly Catholic Tradition is the very strongest argument in the world against the dogmas of Modern Romanism; and, if he is as honest as he claims to be, we shall not be surprised to hear such a confession from him by and by. Even Mr. Brownson, who praises this book most fulsomely, not very long since, in acknowledging the utter impossibility of defending Romanism by such an argument, used the following language, which we commend to Judge Burnett. "These (developmentists) not accepting the authority of the Church, *cannot, without such theory, get over the difficulties presented to their minds by the Fathers, nor can we, without it, satisfactorily explain those difficulties to them.*" On the whole, the book is a curiosity in its way; but, even in the minds of intelligent Romanists themselves, it will not strengthen the cause which it was written to defend. Neither the author's learning nor his reading, is such as to qualify him to be master of his subject. He is simply a special pleader on second-hand testimony, in a case which he has not thoroughly examined.

THE HISTORY OF FRANCE. By PARKE GODWIN. Vol. I, (Ancient Gaul). New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 495.

It is a singular fact that nearly all our American Historians, who have secured distinction by their labors, have been by their education or early profession Rationalists in their religion. And as the modern, and, just now, the popular School of historians, profess to give us not facts merely, annals, events, but the undercurrent, and the fore-casting causes also, so, and for this reason, the social and religious theories and convictions of a historian will aid us in understanding the author and appreciating his value. From all we know of Mr. Godwin we suppose he belongs to the same School of Rationalistic writers and thinkers. Now, of all our best historians, Prescott, Bancroft, Hildreth and Motley, not one of them, in the field that they have chosen, needs to be so utterly free from every thing like a Rationalistic bias, as the man who, as in the volume before us, undertakes to write the history of "Ancient Gaul." For here the Christian element, distinctly so, (we do not say Christianity) was not only the permeating and formative, it was so thoroughly the engrossing and controlling element, that no man can write truly the history of those times who fails to understand what that element is. A blind man might as well criticise the "Last Judgment" of Michael Angelo. Mr. Godwin may write a very able History, a very valuable History, a History which all scholars will buy and read; his work may deserve a great deal of the praise which its warmest friends are bestowing upon it, and yet it may have in it the most serious defects after all. We confess that we have been drawn toward the author in reading his work. It indicates the modesty of a true scholar, the unpretending self-possession of a gen-

tleman, and the honesty of one who writes what, after long and patient research, he believes to be true. His style, too, and bearing as a writer, we like; and we doubt not his history, if he lives to complete it, will be popular, and deservedly so. What we do object to in the book, is the writer's philosophical stand-point which underlies and shapes his work. We cannot substantiate ourselves in this objection at this time. We only quote a single passage. He is describing "Latin Christianity" at the end of the fourth century: "The theories which had long hovered through the Christian mind—as obscure and wavering instincts, if not as distinct thoughts—of a Church which should be the inspired body of Christ, the perpetual keeper and interpreter of the Sacred Records, the sole depository of supernatural power, the supreme dispenser of the divine grace, whose decisions unbarred the gates of hell and opened the portals of heaven, took rapidly a visible substance and shape in the West, which for so many centuries had been accustomed to look to the Eternal City as its nursing mother, and guide, and crowning glory." (p. 212). We have quoted this passage, *verbatim et literatim*, because its peculiar phraseology shows precisely where the author stands in respect to what he calls Christianity.

It is the author's plan to write a narrative of the history of France, from the date of the earliest records to the commencement of the Revolution in 1789. He divides his work into six great periods: I. Ancient Gaul, to the death of Charlemagne. II. Feudal France, closing with St. Louis. III. France, during the national, civil, and religious wars. IV. The three great ministers, Sully, Mazarin, Richelieu. V. The reign of Louis XIV. VI. The Eighteenth Century. Each of these periods will be treated in a single volume, which, as far as the nature of such a work permits, will be complete in itself.

GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By JOHN ALBERT BENGEL. Now first translated into English. With original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Revised and Edited by Rev. Andrew R. Fausset, M.A., Trinity College, Oxford. Third Edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. Five Vols. 8vo.

There are several reasons why we wish to commend this great work of Bengel, and especially this edition of the "GNOMON," to the attention of our readers, and especially of the Clergy. First, the intrinsic value of the work itself; Second, the almost unexampled cheapness of the edition, only $5,00 for five large, compact, neat volumes; and Third, the fact that a pirated edition from the Scottish translation is about to appear in our country in which unwarrantable liberties are taken with Bengel's great Work, such as omissions and alterations, unjust to the original Author, and unfair to the Edinburgh publishers, Messrs. T. and T. Clark, who have brought out the Edition before us at great expense, but who in the absence of an international copyright Law, cannot protect themselves from such an appropriation of their labors. They have, however, reduced the price of the complete American Edition to $5,00; and the work, at this low rate, should have a rapid sale.

Bengel's GNOMON was first published in 1734; and, perhaps, since the Reformation, no Commentary on the New Testament has done so much to incite to a critical study of the Sacred Volume. In doctrine, he is a German Lutheran; and, of course, on the Church and the Sacraments, he comes up to the reality, the strong language of the New Testament, and the Early Patristic Writers. On the Ministry, he is confused, incoherent, and sometimes self-contradictory. But in simple childlike faith, in profound learning, in masterly condensation and suggestiveness, Bengel stands out in marked contrast to the superficial wordy dilutions of our modern

Commentators. It has been well said that the "Gnomon often condenses more matter into a line than can be extracted from many pages of other writers."

The text of Bengel and his edition of the New Testament have been severely criticised, not only by Griesbach, but by more modern scholars; and, undoubtedly, it will not, in all respects, stand the test of modern Canons of Criticism; but when we bear in mind how trivial and unimportant, doctrinally and practically, most of these exceptions are, and when we contrast the genial warmth and sunshine of his devout heart with the freezing coldness of these continental icebergs, we had rather have Bengel's Gnomon for a thorough insight into the true meaning of God's Inspired Word, than all the Commentaries which Rationalistic Critics have ever written. Those of our Clergy, who, discarding the light literature of the day, are in the daily habit of studying critically and devoutly their Greek Testaments—and there is no study for them like this—will find Bengel's Gnomon probably better than any other work for their purpose. He is always profoundly reverential, and like the Early Christian Fathers, he sees great depths of meaning in passages where a sneering rationalism will pronounce his interpretation fanciful and absurd. In this whole matter, we are glad to observe a great reaction in the minds of Churchmen, who are simply coming back to the old and pregnant truth, that "the testimony of JESUS is the spirit of prophecy."

In bringing out the present edition the publishers have secured the *services of several accomplished and thoroughly qualified scholars.* Mr. Fausset, of Trinity College, Dublin, acted as General Editor and Superintendent, and undertook the translation of the Commentary upon the Gospel of Mark, Luke, John, and Acts of the Apostles. The Rev. James Bandinel, of Wadham College, Oxford, translated Bengel's General Preface, and his Commentary upon St. Matthew's Gospel. The Rev. Dr. James Bryce, late of Aberdeen, translated the portion upon the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, and the rest of St. Paul's Epistles. The Rev. Dr. Fletcher, of Wimborne, has executed the translation of the remainder of the work on the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

LIFE OF JESUS; a Manual for Academic Study. By Dr. CARL HASE, Professor of Theology at Jena. Translated from the German of the Third and Fourth Improved Editions by James Freeman Clarke. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 267.

In our April Review we endeavored to show (in Art. II,) that a New and another Gospel is creeping into New England; and we aimed to point out what the duty of the Church is as to this new movement, which threatens to sweep away every vestige of the Gospel from among the descendants of the Puritans. The volume now before us, either openly commended, or spoken tenderly of, by men from whom different things were expected, gives us an opportunity of proving where this "New and another Gospel" comes from. These Ultra-Protestants having given up, for whatever reason, an historic Church, have been driven by a logical necessity to the giving up of a historic CHRIST, if we may use such an expression; to throw away, some of them with blasphemous contempt, some of them with supercilious dignity, some of them with an air of conceited critical acumen, the whole Supernaturalism of the Gospel of Christ. These men are thoroughly consistent—with themselves. The issue is fairly made, whine over it as we may; higgle about it as much as we please in a spirit of pseudo-charity, here are the facts, and these facts

we are bound to meet. It is "The Gospel AND the Church," or it is "Neither Gospel NOR Church." The Church was, and is, and will continue to be, "the Pillar and Ground of the Truth" as it is in Jesus.

As to this Hase's "Life of Jesus," it is not as infamous in its tone as the writings of Strauss, and Bauer, and Greg, and Feuerbach, but it is calculated for that very reason to do even more mischief, as it is very careful not to shock the sensibilities of the faithful by such gross outrage upon everything that is sacred. We can do no more now than give a few specimen quotations, and, with them, we leave the book and the subject for the present with our readers.

"The supposition of a guiding star * * * vanishes before a higher and more accurate knowledge of the starry heavens." As to "the birth from the Virgin, the central point of this circle of legends," * * "every special attempt to prove any thing of the kind, particularly with the purpose of introducing the birth of the Messiah, is deceptive or fantastic." "As Jesus was not morally perfected before his death, it must follow that his perfection is human and limited, and that therefore God alone is perfectly good." "The Temptation of Jesus, regarded as an actual appearance of the Devil, is a useless spectacle, full of inner contradiction, opposed to the character of Jesus, and to every conceivable character of an actual Devil. * * The Temptation is a picture of humanity becoming, through holy convictions, victorious over self-love." "These Miracles could not indeed contradict the laws of the world, which are the constant expression of Divine Will." On the cleansing of the Lepers, he says, "diseases of the skin are often subject to great changes; at all events, the powers of Jesus over leprosy was not an infringement of any well known law of nature." The "Stilling of the Sea," he thus accounts for: "the words intended to console them by communicating this termination of the storm, might have been mistaken for the cause of its cessation." "The destruction of the herd of swine followed as an unforeseen event, which might easily have happened from the panic-struck and sympathetic movements of these animals," &c. &c. &c.

A HISTORY OF GEORGIA, from its first Discovery by the Europeans to the adoption of the present Constitution in 1798. By WILLIAM BACON STEVENS, M.D., D.D., formerly Professor of Belles-Lettres, History, &c., in the University of Georgia. In two Volumes. Vol. II. Philadelphia: 1859. E. H. Butler & Co. 8vo. pp. 524.

After an interval of more than eleven years, this work, undertaken in the outset at the instance of the Georgia Historical Society, has been brought to a conclusion. The work was the more difficult, as well as the more important, in that the field was almost wholly untrodden, and the author has been obliged in his investigations to rely to a great extent upon manuscript materials. These, however, have been abundant, and the writer has evidently found it necessary to condense and suppress, in order to bring the work within the prescribed limits. Dr. Stevens has accomplished his task well. He has the head and the heart to grasp his subject in its full magnitude; and his pages show that he has spared no labor in studying carefully and minutely the developments of the inner life and outward form of social organizations, from the beginning, in this now one of the noblest and most prosperous of the Federal States of the Union. Georgia may, we are sure, be well satisfied with her historian. The writer of such a work is a public benefactor; for it cannot fail to deepen a true national sentiment throughout the country, to strengthen the

bond of brotherhood, and to unite us all by the ties of a warmer sympathy. Bunker Hill and Lexington, already household words throughout the land, are not fuller of heart-stirring associations than the Siege of Augusta, and many a field sacred by deeds of the most heroic suffering, and the loftiest patriotism.

Georgia under Royal Government, in three Chapters; Georgia in the Revolution, in eight Chapters; and Georgia an independent State, in six Chapters, are the subjects of the present and concluding Volume.

The work has a complete Index, and is very handsomely published.

THE PURITANS; Or the Church, Court and Parliament of England, during the Reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth. By SAMUEL HOPKINS. In three Volumes, Vol. II. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 8vo. pp. 539.

The former Volume we did not see. The work is designed to be an elaborate vindication of the Puritans, their character and their policy; and is a thoroughly *ex parte* defence. No portion of English History is more sure to take its hue and complexion from the ecclesiastical and doctrinal affinities of the writer. The work is very handsomely published.

NARRATIVE OF THE EARL OF ELGIN'S MISSION TO CHINA AND JAPAN, IN THE YEARS 1857, '58 and '59. By LAWRENCE OLIPHANT, Esq., Private Secretary to Lord Elgin. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 645.

Notwithstanding the many works recently issued respecting China, this Narrative of Mr. Oliphant will be found interesting and valuable. He was private Secretary to Lord Elgin, who was sent out in 1857 to put an end to the war which had already broken out; and the American, French and Russian Governments had also each determined to seize upon the opportunity to open new commercial relations with China. The history of that war, the final storming of the forts, and the successful passage up the Peiho, the important character of the Treaties of Tientsin, signed in June 1858, are already matters of record. It is a curious circumstance that, in a late letter of Louis Napoleon to the Pope, the Emperor refers to this very treaty in proof of his devotion to the Church of Rome. Rome never fails to watch her interests in such emergencies. Mr. Oliphant narrates carefully the progress of the war, and gives some important information concerning the country, the facilities for commerce, and the habits of the people. One of the best things in the volume is its sketch of Keying, the Chinese Talleyrand, and the description of Chinese diplomacy. Not much is said in the volume, of Christianity in China; or of modern Missions to that country. We infer that Rome is active, and, in a certain sense, successful; indeed, we cannot see why the heathens need hesitate much to adopt that form of religion.

In describing the Romish Mission in the Island of Chusan, Mr. Oliphant, says: "Generally, however, his pupils were the children of converts; the Roman Catholic system being rather to breed converts than to make them; an operation which is becoming daily more and more simple, *as there are upwards of half a million Roman Catholic Christians in the empire.* Out of the entire population of Chusan, estimated at 200,000, the priest calculated that about 250 families were converts. Neither he nor his flock were in any way annoyed by the people, although jealously regarded by the authorities and literati."

In speaking of the Romish Mission at Siccaway under Jesuit control, the author makes some statements as to the genuineness of the conversion of these Chinese

converts, and of the Chinese Christians generally. He says: "the emissaries of that plagiarist on their own philosopher, Mons. Auguste Comte, would have a greater chance of success among the literati of China than those of the Pope. I was informed by a high clerical Protestant authority, that, out of the mass of Protestant converts hitherto made, there were only five whom he really believed to be sincere; and there is no reason to suppose that the proportion should be greater among the more intelligent of the Roman Catholics. Among the ignorant and superstitious, doubtless, many may profess a sort of mongrel belief; but their faith cannot be worth much, when it is obtained by conceding to them the permission to observe their own festivals, to worship at the graves of their ancestors, and go through all their own ceremonies of mourning, with the exception of burning joss-paper. At Chusan, indeed, our reverend friend told us that the converts often refused to take part in these ceremonies; but the fact that they should be permitted to do so, and still retain their Christian name and profession, is significant. The point is one which has caused a serious dissension between the Dominicans and Jesuits, the latter being in favor of the greatest latitude being given to the religious practices of the converts." His account of the American Missions is a little more encouraging. We do not, however, attach much importance to his opinions on this whole subject, for various reasons. Mr. Oliphant's stay in Japan was brief. He confirms previous reports of that remarkable country and people. We wish the Messrs. Harpers would reprint the work of Kæmpfer, which is the basis of almost all our modern works on that country. The work before us is well illustrated with good cuts; and there are some valuable statistics and scientific tables in the Appendix.

SATANSTOE; or the Littlepage Manuscripts. A Tale of the Colony. By J. FENIMORE COOPER. Illustrated from Drawings by F. O. C. Darley. 12mo. pp. 501. THE MONIKINS, &c. 12mo. pp. 454.

Messrs. W. A. TOWNSEND & Co., New York, are issuing promptly this beautiful edition of the Novels of J. FENIMORE COOPER. "Satanstoe" is one of the very best of his works; it exhibits the author's keen insight into the peculiar genius of some of the Early Colonies, and it foretold with striking sagacity some of the dangers which now threaten even the existence of our National Institutions.

THE PRESBYTERIAN HISTORICAL ALMANAC and Annual Remembrancer of the Church, for 1860. By JOSEPH M. WILSON. Volume Second. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson. 1860. 8vo. pp. 327.

There has not, in our country, as far as we know, been a work of the kind so thoroughly and completely executed as the volume before us. It is a royal octavo, of 327 pages, giving full statistics, catalogues of names, summaries of operations, &c., &c., of every branch of this large denomination. So that we have here, at a glance, the precise numerical strength of Presbyterianism in each and every portion of our own country, and wherever else it exists. "It gives the Names, Presbytery and Post-office address of over 10,000 Presbyterian Ministers. It gives eighteen sketches of congregations, in whose houses the General Assemblies and Synods of 1859 met, with eleven full views of Church edifices, and portraits of sixteen of the Moderators." There is no other Protestant denomination in our country which so closely approaches the Church in its thorough conservatism; and none in whose prospects we have a deeper interest. Several of the Portraits, contained in the

volume, are a study; and, we hope our Presbyterian friends will permit a very amusing one. They remind us of a picture gallery of the old P thies; each one of whom looks as if he had just swallowed the "Five Poi There is a great deal more in this denominational physiognomy, or th nomical denominationalism, than is generally supposed. Sydney Smith w ty and wicked when he said, that "Some persons think they are very pious are only bilious;" but he was more than half right after all. A friend of o remarked, that in traveling he could almost always pronounce on the de alism of the passengers whom he met in the Car or the Boat. This use But now-a-days, most men's physiognomy, and women's too, is marked glaring worldliness, in which, religiously, there is no belief in anything i

SOCIAL RELATIONS IN OUR SOUTHERN STATES. By D. R. HUNDLEY, York: Henry B. Price. 1860. 12mo. pp. 367.

We think this the very best picture of Society in the Southern State yet been drawn. The Author is a Southerner by birth and education, studied and resided at the North till he seems to understand thoroughl liarities of Northern character; and he describes the South, in its habits its manners, its *morale*, its institutions, in short, Society in all its varied it would appear to any well educated gentleman of the North. The t North and the South are very unlike each other. They were settled, to tent, either by different nations, or by different classes of people; and th nationalities of character are still perpetuated in a strong degree, and a continue. The great mass of Northern people know very little of the is this ignorance in a way to be enlightened so long as our professional b like Mrs. Stowe and Mr. Abbott, find it pays handsomely to pander t prejudice, and our political demagogues make a hobby of minding oth business instead of their own. And so, these national dissimilarities o as well as of institutions, have already ripened into mutual aver threatens to end in something much more serious. Mr. Hundley is no nate eulogist; he recognizes the distinction between the gentleman an the man and the fop, the true nobleman and the genuine cockney, whe North or the South; and his book may be read profitably in both sec subjects of his eight chapters are: The Southern Gentleman; The Midd The Southern Yankee; Cotton Snobs; The Southern Yeoman; The So ly; Poor White Trash; The Negro Slaves.

A KNOWLEDGE OF LIVING THINGS, With the Laws of their Existence. BELL, A. M., M. D., Late Surgeon U. S. Navy, &c. New York: Baill ers, 440 Broadway. 1860. 12mo. pp. 318.

Dr. Bell having delivered a course of Lectures, at the Packer Collegia on Physiology and Hygiene, was induced, by the request of teachers them, to put them in their present form. *Human* Physiology, the high that Science, is not to be mastered without first gaining a knowledge of ments which are the basis of that Science; and hence, Dr. Bell comm the most elementary principles, and proceeds, step by step, through all forms of organic life; from the simplest prototype, scarcely distinguisha organic matter, to the consideration of the most complex of all living be a thoughtful work, and certainly does great credit to the author for its c

close observation and scientific analysis; and will abundantly repay the attention of those who take any interest in such studies. The work is profusely illustrated, and is well adapted, both in its style and structure, for instruction in High Schools and Academies.

CLERGY IN MARYLAND of the Protestant Episcopal Church since the Independence of 1783. By Rev. ETHAN ALLEN, D.D., of the Diocese of Maryland. Baltimore: James S. Waters. 1860. 8vo. pp. 106.

We receive this book just as our Notices are put to press, and have only time to say, to the Clergy especially, that they have a rich treat before them. Dr. Allen has given, as far as he has been able, the place of nativity, their religious connection by birth or early education, their Ordination, when and by whom; their parishes, &c.; their publications; the year &c. of the death of those who are dead; with incidental notices, &c. &c. of all the Clergy, who not only since the Independence of 1783, but from the earliest settlement of the country, have been settled in the Diocese of Maryland. Those who know Dr. Allen will expect to see a model work of its kind, and such indeed it is. The systematic arrangement and condensation of matter, its introduction and its concluding Summary, are just what we might expect from the author's industry, accuracy, and good judgment. The whole number of the Clergy whose brief history is given is 550: of whom there were 38 previous to the close of the War of the Revolution. Each of the older Dioceses needs just such a chronicler.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA; A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Volume IX. Hayne—Jersey City. 1860. 8vo. pp. 784.

We have frequently had occasion already to consult this "New Cyclopedia" as a work of reference, and almost always with entire satisfaction. It has a special value in that its Articles, particularly those on the Useful Arts and Physical Science, comprise the very latest inventions and discoveries, and are in the main, thoroughly written. There is great disproportion in the Articles as to length, and inequality as to style: but the reader will rarely fail to find in the New Cyclopedia the very information he desires on almost any subject.

OLD LEAVES; Gathered from Household Words. By W. HENRY WILLS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 467.

The great mass of people, and of very clever and intelligent people, too, whose lives move on evenly and regularly, little know how much of stirring adventure, of moral and social inequality there is in the world and all about them, even at their very doors. Mr. Wills has drawn nearly all his Sketches from Life in London; and yet, *mutatis mutandis*, it is the story of Life in any of our large cities. The Post Office, the Police Station, a Pawnbroker's Shop, the Custom House, Railway Waifs and Strays, are among the subjects of the writer's graphic descriptions.

DISQUISITIONS AND NOTES ON THE GOSPELS—MATTHEW. By JOHN H. MORRISON. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 538.

Among the Unitarians of our country at the present day, there is every possible shade of opinion, from old fashioned genuine Arianism, down to the very latest form of open scoffing denial of everything like Supernaturalism in Christianity. Recent events seem to have forced upon them the necessity of defending them-

selves in the rejection of the old Catholic Symbols of the Faith, to the reception of which many of the best minds and hearts among them feel that they must come. Mr. Morrison's volume of Notes and Disquisitions is written with this intent. Its tone is more devout than most of the works of its kind. As for the argument in this and one or two other late Unitarian works, we propose to say something in another and early No. of the Review.

FRAGMENTS FROM THE STUDY OF A PASTOR. By the Rev. GEORGE W. NICHOLS, A.M. New York: Henry B. Price. 1860. 12mo. pp. 252.

Mr. Nichols having been prevented by long continued illness from discharging the duties of his profession, has collected and published these "Fragments," most of which have appeared in several of the Church papers. The volume is made up of the author's reminiscences of pastoral life and experience; etchings of several Church worthies, among others of Bishop Griswold, the late Judge Jay and his venerable father; brief sketches of natural scenery, &c. &c. The author writes in an easy flowing style, and in simple narrative is particularly successful. The volume is a very readable one, and is adapted especially to Sunday School Libraries.

THE LIFE OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. By JAMES W. SHEAHAN. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 528.

Mr. Sheahan is a political friend of Mr. Douglas, and a warm personal admirer. He has given a pretty full account of the life and public services of Mr. Douglas, from his boyhood down to the present day, and has incorporated into his narrative several of Mr. Douglas' most important Speeches. The book is very well written. Mr. Douglas was born at Brandon, Vermont, April 23, 1813.

LESSONS AT THE CROSS, &c. By SAMUEL HOPKINS. With an Introduction by George W. Blagden, D.D. *Seventh Edition.* Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 374.

GOTTHOLD'S EMBLEMS; or Invisible Things Understood by things that are made. By CHRISTIAN SCRIVER, Minister of Magdeburg in 1671. Translated from the Twenty-Eighth German Edition. By the Rev. Robert Menzies, Hoddam, England. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 316.

THE CAXTONS; A Family Picture. By Sir EDWARD BULWER LYTTON, Bart. Library Edition. (Forming the First Volume of Harper's Library Edition of Bulwer's Novels). New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 505.

THE MILL ON THE FLOSS. By GEORGE ELIOT, Author of "Adam Bede," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 464.

We have in this American reprint of an English book, an illustration of the cheapness of the American over the English editions. This popular Novel, which is sold by the Harpers for about a dollar, is advertised in the English papers in three octavo volumes, at $7,87½. The author received in London $10,000 for the first, and $5,000 for the second edition; and a handsome bonus for a popular edition.

AGAINST WIND AND TIDE. By HOLMES LEE, Author of "Sylvan Hall's Daughter," &c. New York: W. A. Townsend & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 436.

LIFE BEFORE HIM. A Novel. New York: W. A. Townsend & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 401.

FRESH HEARTS THAT FAILED THREE THOUSAND YEARS AGO; with Other Things. By the Author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay." Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

This attractive book comes to hand too late for a careful examination in this No.

THE SATIRES OF JUVENAL, PERSIUS, SULPICIA AND LUCILIUS, literally Translated into English Prose. With Notes, Chronological Tables, Arguments, &c. By the Rev. LEWIS EVANS, M.A., late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford. To which is added the Metrical Version of Juvenal and Persius. By the late WILLIAM GIFFORD, Esq. Portrait. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 512.

Of the great Satirist, Juvenal, confessedly the most difficult writer in the Latin language, Gifford's is undoubtedly the best metrical translation ever made. The Satire of Sulpicia and the Fragments of Lucilius are now given in English for the first time.

HARPERS' SERIES OF SCHOOL AND FAMILY READERS. By MARCIUS WILLSON, Author of History of the United States, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Of this Series, five volumes are already issued, a Primer, and a First, Second, Third, and Fourth Reader. In the first volumes of the Series the selections are specially designed to promote naturalness of intonation; and it is almost impossible for the child to read them in that dry, measured artificial manner, which is so common. In the latter volumes the Reading Lessons are devoted to the Natural Sciences; so that by anecdotes, pictorial illustrations, and an attractive style, the attention of the pupil is awakened and he is instructed, while at the same time the art of reading is acquired. The volumes are published very neatly, and may be confidently commended to the attention of parents and teachers.

AN ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY; Classical and Sacred. By S. AUGUSTUS MITCHELL, Author of a Series of Geographical works. Designed for the use of Schools and Colleges. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 339.

Every reader of Ancient History, sacred and profane, must have felt the want of just such a compact, well arranged, and carefully compiled Manual as this.

STORIES OF RAINBOW AND LUCKY; The Three Pines. By JACOB ABBOTT. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 190.

THE BOY INVENTOR; a Memoir of Matthew Edwards, Mathematical-Instrument Maker. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 109.

KIND WORDS FOR CHILDREN. By HARVEY NEWCOMB. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. 12mo. pp. 141.

MITCHELL'S NEW INTERMEDIATE GEOGRAPHY. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1860. 4to. pp. 104.

Mitchell's Series of Geographies has long maintained a high reputation. This fine large quarto is an entirely new work; there are twenty-three Maps from copper plates, representing the latest geographical divisions and discoveries. The Map of California, Oregon and the Territories, is the best we have seen.

CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLDS. By Mrs. LINCOLN PHELPS, with an appendix containing the History of "The Church Home and Infirmary" of Baltimore. 16mo.

THE SCRIPTURE HISTORY OF JESUS CHRIST OUR BLESSED LORD AND SAVIOUR. Arranged to illustrate His Divinity, Doctrine and Mission. By M. B. STERLING CLARK.

SUNDAY ENJOYMENTS: or Religion made pleasant to Children.

Mr. Dana, 381 Broadway, New York, has recently published the above three little volumes; the two last will be valuable additions to family and Sunday School Libraries.

The first volume on the list, by Mrs. Phelps, should be read by every husband and wife in the country, and by their households. The writer has evidently watched closely the workings of social life under our peculiar institutions, and her suggestions are worthy of a saint and a sage. The history in the Appendix, of "the Church Home and Infirmary" at Baltimore, is exceedingly interesting, and shows that with the growth of a strong Churchly element among us, in distinction from a mere Individualism or irresponsible clannish Voluntaryism, there is also the development of a life and power which will make the Church what Christ meant His Church to be, in our world of sin, and suffering, and poverty. Such "Church Homes" are springing up all over the land, and are among the brightest signs of the times; for they indicate a healthy tone of the heart and a true conception of Christian duty in this regard.

STORIES OF INVENTORS AND DISCOVERERS IN SCIENCE AND THE USEFUL ARTS; A book for Old and Young. By JOHN TIMBS, F.S.A. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 473.

The wonderful progress in modern times in the knowledge of Physical Science and the application of its laws to the Useful Arts, render this volume an interesting and valuable one. Aside from the information it gives of the most distinguished Inventors and Discoverers, its influence will be felt in impressing the public mind with the importance of our public Schools, Colleges and Universities, and in showing their high claims to a liberal public support. Of the Sixty Narratives in this volume, the greater part are selected from modern times; yet some interesting information is given, and some popular mistakes corrected, as to the extent to which certain discoveries were carried by the genius of the most ancient times known in history.

TWENTY-FIVE TUNES ADAPTED TO PSALMS AND HYMNS IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. Edited by the Rev. ALBERT WOOD, A.M. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1860. 8vo. pp. 29.

This little volume is offered as a contribution towards a consummation not yet, in the Editor's judgment, attained—the furnishing of the Psalms and Hymns in our Prayer Book with suitable music. The Metres in which tunes are here provided are those in which the number of really good tunes is limited; we have heard a considerable number of these Tunes tried, and have found the music simple, rich, and Church-like. One or two of the tunes are worth many times the cost of the volume.

BISHOP LAY'S SERMON at the Consecration of the Church of the Nativity, Huntsville, Ala., Jan. 29, 1860.

These parting words of the Bishop to his late congregation on this interesting occasion, are full of that quiet power speaking out in tones of touching tenderness and exquisite beauty, which so characterizes everything that we have seen from his

I. He is just the man to lay broad and deep the foundations of the Church in his t Missionary field, and to win the confidence of the Church at large in his port.

V. DR. BERRIAN'S SEMI-CENTENNIAL SERMON in Trinity Parish, New York City, larch 18th, 1860.

The reminiscences of the venerable Rector of Trinity Parish—and they are lestly and beautifully expressed—covering the last half century, read almost a fairy tale, so wonderful have been the changes in that city within this brief iod. The growth of the Church in New York City has been remarkable.

VIII. STATISTICS of Christ Church, Elizabeth, N. J., and Seventh Annual Address f the Rector, 1860.

The statistics of this thriving Parish certainly do not look very much like a ure of the Free Church System.

IX. JOSEPH BREWSTER'S PASTORAL LETTER to the Parishioners of Christ Church, New Haven, Conn. Easter, 1860.

The ability and zeal with which Mr. Brewster is prosecuting the Free Church enprise and the missionary work of the Church in this old city, are worthy of all amendation, and will, we doubt not, be crowned with abundant success.

X. H. N. PIERCE'S SERMON at Odd Fellows' Hall, New Orleans, La., Mar. 4, 1860. 'Free Churches able to support themselves."

We know something of this Free Church effort at New Orleans, undertaken by Rev. B. S. Dunn, and are sure that a work entered upon with so much faith, l prayer, and wisdom, and perseverance, cannot fail. A nobler band of laymen er rallied around a truer-hearted leader of Christ's Sacramental host.

XI. T. MCPETER'S SERMON in Calvary Church, New York, Mar. 4, 1860, in behalf f the Church Mission to the Public Institutions of New York City, 1860.

This Sermon opens up a new field of Church activity already entered upon. We pectfully suggest to those chronic croakers among us over the want of life in the urch, themselves meanwhile wandering into all sorts of latitudinarian by-ways, t for once to take for their horoscope any one of a dozen fields of vision which now opening to their view, and of which this Mission is one.

XII. REPORT OF THE HOUSE OF MERCY. New York: Pudney & Russell. 1860. 12mo. pp. 24.

XIII. DR. TOTTEN'S ADDRESS on University Education, in the Representatives Hall, Des Moines, Iowa, Feb. 6, 1860.

Dr. Totten's argument aims to prove that Universities, even on the low ground of pediency, are entitled to liberal State patronage, and his argument is unanswerable.

XIV. DR. WILLIAM SHELTON'S Sermon before the Associate Alumni of the Gen. Theo. Seminary, in St. Paul's Church, Richmond, Va. Oct. 14, 1859.

A noble, manly, vigorous presentation of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, a doctrine which every Churchman is bound in honesty to believe.

NASHOTAH MISSION. Annual Letter for 1859–60.

This noble Institution, which has lived out and lived down all opposition, has grown into a position of so much importance as to justify the most liberal appropriations for its support.

CATALOGUE OF BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, 1860, Middletown, Conn.

There are now twenty-five Students on the Catalogue; the rooms are full and new buildings are soon to be erected.

CATALOGUE OF ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE, Palmyra, Mo., 1859–60.

In this young College, of which the Rev. Dr. McMasters is President, there are now, in all the Departments, 82 students.

REV. DR. A. H. VINTON'S Sermon at the Institution of the Rev. Wm. R. Nicholson, D.D., in St. Paul's Church, Boston, Mass., Jan. 11, 1860. "The Christian Watchman."

The points without the walls, and within the walls of Zion, on which the Watchman is to keep his eye fastened at the present day, are enunciated in this Sermon with a directness and manliness worthy of note.

REV. R. WISTAR MORRIS'S SERMON, on the Forty-eighth Anniversary of the Advancement &c. Society, in St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, Jan. 8, 1860.

A heart-stirring Sermon, and its historical reminiscences have the power of a war-cry.

REV. W. B. W. HOWE'S SERMON on the Death of Rev. Cranmore Wallace, in St. Stephen's Chapel, Charleston, S. C., Feb. 12, 1860.

An affectionate tribute to the memory of one of the best of men, and most faithful of Priests.

BISHOP MCILVAINE'S SERMON (in 1839) on the Origin and Design of the Christian Ministry.

REV. DR. W. B. STEVENS' SERMON. The Book of Prayer for the House of Prayer.

The Messrs. Ide, of Claremont, N. H., have published these admirable Sermons in a neat form, and at a low rate, for gratuitous distribution. Let them be scattered by the thousand.

A PLAIN LECTURE to Enquirers into the meaning of the Liturgy. Toronto, 1860. pp. 24.

As an argument for Liturgical Worship, and an answer to popular objections to the Prayer Book, this is one of the most valuable works that we have ever seen.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
ishop, E. Ferris,	Williams,	May 21, 1860,	Nativity, Bridgeport, Conn.
ameron, James,	Kip,	Apr. 15, 1860,	Trinity, San Francisco, Cal.
ompton, Theodore F.	Potter, H.	June 1, 1860,	St. John's Chapel, New York City.
orneille, Samuel J.	Potter, H.	June 1, 1860,	St. John's Chapel, New York City.
stwell, Wm. V.	Bowman,	May 4, 1860,	St. Peter's, Philadelphia, Pa.
owler, Morelle,	Williams,	May 30, 1860,	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
ost, Henry M.	Smith,	Apr. 20, 1860,	Ascension, Frankfort, Ky.
odhue, Jonathan,	Williams,	May 30, 1860,	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
iffin, J. W.	Bedell,	Mar. 18, 1860,	Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
yland, Thomas A.	Potter, H.	Mar. 21, 1860,	Incarnation, New York City.
ckson, Wm. F. B.	Potter, H.	Mar. 21, 1860,	Incarnation, New York City.
hnson, George D.	Williams,	May 30, 1860,	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
sing, Franklin S.	Potter, H.	Apr. 19, 1860,	Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
wland, Edmund,	Williams,	May 30, 1860,	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn.
iswell, Alvah,	Potter, H.	June 1, 1860,	St. John's Chapel, New York City.

PRIESTS.*

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Adams, Henry,	McIlvaine,	Mar. 28, 1860,	St. Paul's, Akron, Ohio.
" Baker, Edw. F.	Potter, H.	Apr. 19, 1860,	Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
" Dunnell, Wm. N.	Odenheimer,	May26, 1860,	Trinity, Red Bank, N. Jersey.
" Ferguson, L. D.	DeLancey,	Mar. 27, 1860,	Christ, Oswego, N. Y.
" Githens, Wm. L.	Upfold,	Apr. 29, 1860,	Trinity, Vanderberg Co., Indiana.
" Haines, C. R.	Meade,	Apr. 29, 1860,	——— Tappahannock, Va.
" Harris, George,	Otey,	Mar. 25, 1860,	St. Mary's, Memphis, Tenn.
" McCarty, J. W.	Bedell,	Apr. 15, 1860,	Trinity, Newark, Ohio.
" Paddock, W. F.	McIlvaine,	May 20, 1860,	St. Paul's, Cleaveland, Ohio.
" Punnett, T. W.	Williams,	Apr. 22, 1860,	St. James, New London, Conn.
" Roberts, Wm.	DeLancey,	Mar. 27, 1860,	Christ, Oswego, N. Y.
" Skinner, Henry A.	Atkinson,	May 13, 1860,	St. Peter's, Charlotte, N. C.
" Tracy, Uriah T.	Potter, H.	Apr. 19, 1860,	Christ, Bay Ridge, N. Y.
" True, Edward H.	Williams,	Apr. 22, 1860,	St. James, New London, Conn.
" Waddill, J. C.	Cobbs,	May 6, 1860,	St. Paul's, Selma, Ala.
" Wainwright, J. A.	Atkinson,	May 17, 1860,	St. John's, Wilmington, N. C.

* ERRATA.—The record of the Ordination of the Rev. Messrs. Forbes and Hubard, of N. C., in the January No. was inserted by mistake in the absence of the Editor. No such Ordination took place.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Advent,	Smith,	May 19, 1860,	Cynthiana, Kentucky.
Calvary,	Eastburn,	May 25, 1860,	Danvers, Mass.
Christ,	Davis,	Apr. 12, 1860,	Columbia, S. C.
Christ,	Gregg,	Apr. 15, 1860,	Matagorda, Texas.
Christ,	Lee,	May 17, 1860,	Dover, Delaware.
Ch. of Redeemer,	Clark,	Dec. 20, 1859,	Providence, R. I.
Ch. of Redeemer,	DeLancey,	Apr. 5, 1860,	Addison, N. Y.
Ch. of our Saviour,	Williams,	Apr. 10, 1860,	Plainville, Conn.
Grace,	Hawks,	Apr. 15, 1860,	St. Louis, Mo.
Grace,	Hawks,	May 27, 1860,	Kirkwood, Mo.
St. Andrew's,	Williams,	Apr. 17, 1860,	Thompsonville, Conn.
St. John's,	Kip,	Mar. 4, 1860,	Oakland, Cal.
St. Mary's,	Atkinson,	Mar. 1, 1860,	Kinston, N. C.
St. Michael's,	Cobbs,		Marengo Co., Ala.
Trinity,	McCoskry,	Apr. 15, 1860,	Niles, Mich.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

The Rev. HORACE HALL REID, late Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Millburn, N. Jersey, died suddenly at Geneva, Switzerland, on the morning of March 17, 1860, at the age of 36 years. His body was found upon the marble floor of the lower hall of the Hotel de Couronne, cold and lifeless. Mr. Giles, the American Consul at Geneva, was called at once, and it was decided, from all indications, that he had arisen during the night, and had fallen accidentally over the baluster from the second story (the railing being very low) upon the stone floor beneath, and was killed immediately.

HORACE HALL REID was the fourth son of Edward Reid, of New York City, and Sophia Hubbard, of Charlestown, New Hampshire, in which place he was born, Sept. 25, 1822. His parents were Unitarians then, if anything; but, after removing to New York, they united with the Presbyterians. His early life was spent in New York, where he prepared for College at the "Cornelius Institute," under Rev. J. J. Owen. He entered Yale College, 1839, and graduated with honor, 1843. After spending one and a half years as Principal of the Academy in Bedford, Westchester Co., N. York, he was admitted Candidate for Orders in the Church, in April, 1844, and entered the General Theological Seminary in New York, in October, 1845. After completing the prescribed course of study, he was ordained Deacon by Bishop DeLancey, in Grace Church, New York City, on the 2d Sunday after Trinity, July 2, 1848, and, immediately after his ordination, officiated for some months as Assistant to the Rev. Dr. Wyatt, Rector of St. Paul's Church in Baltimore. Thence he removed to Paris, near Lexington, Kentucky, and took charge of St. Peter's Church in that place, for a year or more. Here he was ordained to the Priesthood by Bishop Smith, on Whitsunday, 1849. At Easter, 1850, he accepted a call to the Rectorship of Christ Church, Watertown, Conn., where he remained nearly seven years, leaving a lasting monument to his memory, in a pleasant Rectory and a handsome new Church edifice. On the 1st of Jan., 1857, he entered upon the Rectorship of St. Stephen's Church, Millville, in Millburn, New Jersey, which parish he resigned with impaired health, Nov. 1, 1859, to travel abroad, and realize, as he

often expressed himself, "the dream of his life." He was admitted M. A., *ad eundem*, in Trinity College, Hartford, 1846, and at the Commencement, in 1855, was chosen Junior Fellow of that Institution. He married, Sept. 1, 1851, Miss Mary Lucia Brown, daughter of Rev. G. C. Brown, of West Bloomfield, New York. They have had three children,—all sons,—William Herbert, Horace Cleveland and Arthur Condit; the eldest of whom only survives.

It was his intention to return to the "Church of the Holy Communion," at South Orange, N. J., a parish which was organized through his instrumentality while Rector at Millburn, and in which he felt a deep interest. The four different parishes over which he devoted his labors, each passed appropriate resolutions; and at Watertown and Millburn, they are to erect tablets to his memory in the chancels of the Church.

The Rev. H. F. GREENE died in Raleigh, N. C., Feb. 28, aged 36 years. He had been appointed Editor of the New Southern Church Newspaper, *The Church Intelligencer*, and had issued a Prospectus, but died before the first No. of the Paper appeared. We can get no sketch of his early life.

The Rev. AARON CHRISTMAN died in Philadelphia, March 30th. He had been, for several years, Rector of Calvary Church, in that City, but immediately previous to his death, was a Missionary in Texas, whither he had gone for the benefit of his health. We can get no sketch of his early history.

The Rev. HENRY H. HICKMAN, Minister of St. Martin's Church, Marcus Hook, Penn., died at that place, May 2d, 1860, aged 27 years. He was a convert to the Church from the Methodists; was young, and full of zeal and promise. We can get no sketch of his early history.

The Rev. JOHN WARD died at Lexington, Ky., May 2d, in the 81st year of his age. He was born at Litchfield, Connecticut. He received Deacon's Orders in New Haven, Conn., Dec. 1st, 1805; and Priest's Orders, Oct. 11, 1807, in New London, Conn., from the Rt. Rev. Bishop Jarvis. In 1808 he was Asssistant Minister of Trinity Church, Newport, Rhode Island, the Rector of which was the Rev., afterwards better known as the Rt. Rev.. Theodore Dehon. For several years, from 1813, he was Rector of Christ Church, Lexington, Kentucky, and also officiated at Paris. In 1829, being then Principal of a young ladies' Academy in Lexington, he took part with the Rev. Dr. Chapman and others, in the primary organization of the Diocese of Kentucky, from which period his active participation in the affairs of the Diocese began to decline.

DIED on Friday, April 20th, 1860, GEO. S. YERGER, aged 58 years. He was a native of Maryland; a resident of Nashville, Tennessee, from early life until 1838; at which time he moved to Mississippi. He died suddenly, of a disease of the heart, while out hunting, near his plantation in Yazoo County. With regard to a character so eminently worthy, we have no eulogy to write. This duty is left to the historian of the Church and State. It may be due to his memory, in a notice of this kind, to intimate a few of the outlines of his career, upon which his biographer will dwell, and which all others, who admire the great and good, will examine with interest.

Many years ago, Mr. Yerger was elected Reporter of the Decisions of the Su-

preme Court of Tennessee, which aided in establishing his legal reputation in our own and other countries. His elaborate arguments before the tribunals of different States, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in defence of the rights of men and Constitutional freedom, entitle him to a reputation among the foremost of his profession.

As a Churchman, he was no ultraist. Profoundly learned in the doctrines and principles of the Faith, he was always ready to defend them. His published opinion, in the case of Bishop Ives, touching the Private Confessional, and other errors of the Bishop, before he was tried and deposed, is very able and conclusive. The tone of Christian sentiment which pervades every line, is sufficient to recommend an examination by all persons who doubt as to the coincidence of his opinion and the Church upon this subject.

His refutation of Macaulay's views of the Church, and his having clearly established the fact of the *prejudices* of the historian, (which have marred the consistency in other respects of this work of English history,) is a valuable accession to Church literature. There is no extravagance in the statement, that the demise of such a man is a great loss to the Church at large; and the Church can claim few Laymen of superior intelligence, influence and Christian worth, in any age or in any land.

The day of his funeral obsequies at Jackson, Mississippi, presented a scene of the deepest solemnity. The Mayor and Common Council of the City, clothed in emblems of sorrow, attended his remains, in company with his professional cotemporaries, to the grave. Political Conventions adjourned, Judicial business was suspended, all business closed. The Judges of the High Court of Errors and Appeals, the Rev. and dignified functionaries of Church and State, delegations from neighboring cities and towns, were there. Members of all denominations of Christians, the old and the young, the high and the low, the widow and the fatherless, the bond and the free, had assembled together to betow the last sad offices to the memory of a noble spirit. The Military, with rifles and muffled drum, mingled their tears of grief with the vast multitude, as they marched, under the sound of tolling of bells, to the last resting-place of the distinguished dead.

We have stated that he died suddenly. *He was alone.* No eye had seen him; no ear heard the voice of complaint. *God was there!* His was rather a translation than a death, and to borrow the sentiment so appropriately applied by the divine who pronounced his worthy eulogium, like Enoch of old, "He walked with God, and was not, for God took him."

ELECTION OF BISHOP OF KANSAS.

A Special Convention of the Diocese of Kansas was held in Grace Church, Topeka, April 11th, for the election of a Bishop. Eight Clergymen were present, viz.: the Rev. Messrs. C. M. Callaway, David Clarkson, J. H. Drummond, George D. Henderson, R. S. Nash, N. O. Preston, Charles Reynolds, and Joseph E. Ryan. Eight Parishes were represented by lay delegates. The Rev. Charles Reynolds said Evening Prayer, and the Convention sermon was preached by the Rev. N. O. Preston, from 2 Cor. iv. 7. After divine service, the Convention was organized for business by the election of the Rev. R. S. Nash, of Wyandot, as President, and the Rev. Joseph E. Ryan, of Elwood, as Secretary. On motion of the Rev. Mr. Calla-

way, the Convention proceeded to an election, and the following is the result of the twelve ballotings:

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]
Rev. Mr. Whittle,	3	3	3	4	6	--	1	1	2	--	--	--
Rev. Mr. Schenck,	1	1	1	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--
Rev. Dr. Claxton,	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--
Rev. Dr. Peet,	2	1	1	2	--	3	2	2	1	3	2	--
Rev. Dr. Dyer,	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	3	1	6
Rev. Dr. Newton,	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Rev. Mr. Pratt,	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--
Blank,	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1
Rev. Dr. Butler,	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1
Whole number,	8	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

Necessary for a choice, 5.

On the fifth ballot, the Rev. Francis M. Whittle, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Louisville, Kentucky, was declared to be the choice of the Clergy; but the Laity refused to concur by a vote of ayes 2, nays 4: the total vote being 6. On the twelfth ballot, the Rev. Dr. Dyer having been declared the choice of the Clergy, the Laity concurred by a vote of ayes 5, nays 2, blank 1: the total vote being 8; whereupon the President announced that the Rev. Dr. Dyer having received a majority of votes of both Orders, was duly elected Bishop of the Diocese of Kansas. Dr. Dyer has declined the appointment. It is said there were informalities in the election, which would have rendered it null and void.

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL AT MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

The corner-stone of a new Chapel for the use of the Divinity School, was laid by Bishop Williams with appropriate ceremonies on Wednesday, May 30. It being the day appointed for Ordination at the Seminary, large numbers of Clergy and laity were present. The Bishop stated in his Address that the Chapel is to be built as a Memorial of one who has gone to his rest, by his widow, who thus erects the noblest of all mausoleums. A large band of young men are already gathered around the Bishop and his Assistants in the Seminary; and all are hard at work. The Bishop's Addresses at the Ordination and the laying of the Corner Stone, were worthy of a young Catholic Bishop in these days of Athenian novelty-chasing and Protean infidelity. The Seminary promises, with God's blessing, to do a great work for the whole Church.

MISSIONARY MOVEMENTS.

Mission to Brazil.—Rev. Richard Holden, a graduate of the Gambier Seminary, is about to proceed to Brazil under the auspices of the Foreign Committee. For his work Mr. Holden has peculiar advantages. For years a resident in Brazil, he is well acquainted with the language and usages of the people among whom he is to minister. Independently of his theological training, he has been going through a course of medical instruction.

Mission to Jefferson Territory.—The Rev. John H. Kehler, recently of Maryland, has removed to Denver City, J. T., and has organized a parish. He says:

"Denver City, my present place of residence, lies at the base of the Rocky Mountains, distant 750 miles from Leavenworth City, Kansas. The nearest Clergyman of our Church is Rev. C. M. Callaway, of Topeka, distant about 700 miles.

We have succeeded in organizing a congregation here, which, with the blessing of God, promises to do well. We have received a donation, from the Town Company of sixteen lots, on which we intend erecting an Episcopal Church and Parsonage in the course of the summer. The Church is to be of the Gothic style, of sufficient dimensions to seat about four hundred persons. It is to be styled 'St. John's in the Wilderness.' The Parish is self-supporting from the very first."

CHURCH LIFE IN PHILADELPHIA.

A new "EPISCOPAL HOSPITAL" has already been established in Philadelphia. One hundred thousand dollars have been secured to erect a new building. For this a plan has been adopted which will give at first one hundred and fifty beds, and afterwards, when the whole is under roof, two hundred and fifty. The work is to be at once begun.

THE EPISCOPAL RECORDER AND THE WORD "KATHOLISCHE."

The *Ep. Recorder*, in its issue of May 12th, takes us severely to task for sustaining our Church Committee in the use of the word *Katholische* in the German translation of the Prayer Book. In the same paper of June 2nd, is a letter from Prof. Fernando Varro, of Washington College, Pa., thoroughly sustaining the Committee; bringing the whole argument within the compass of a nut-shell; maintaining that the word "*Katholische*," "carries the very unction of Apostolic antiquity within itself;" and is "the *one* and only term proper to convey the full and Christian meaning of the English word Catholic." We suspect that Prof. Varro has hit upon the real secret of this opposition to the word *Katholische*.

METHODIST CONFERENCE ON SLAVERY.

The General Methodist Conference, which meets once in four years, has had a large attendance, and a long and stormy Session, at Buffalo, N. Y. The former General Rule allowed slave-holders admission to their "Church." A majority report of the Committee on Slavery brought forward a rule, which prohibits "the buying, selling, or holding of men, women or children with an intention to enslave them." On the 1st of June, the new Chapter was adopted by a vote of 154 to 57; an overwhelming majority. A Resolution was adopted that the Chapter is declaratory and advisory, not mandatory; but the Abolitionists hailed the result of the vote with tumultuous applause.

The able Editor of the "Advocate and Journal," Dr. Stevens, a more conservative man, declined a re-election distinctly on the ground of the revolutionary and radical elements which now threaten to rend that large body to fragments. After saying that "Though no man should evade responsibility in a time of public calamity like that which is now upon the Church," he thus continues: "What he has suffered for his faithfulness to his principles and to the honorable pledge of his Conference is too well known to need here a word of remark. He falls to-day on the battery which he has long occupied, without striking his old flag, and with his

gun pointed unswervingly in its old direction. He impeaches not his brethren
) are responsible for the new controversies and new principles which have since
ng up among us, and which, after throwing us into general confusion and exas-
tion, now threaten our unity and prospects as a Church."
he Methodists have once before split on this subject, the South from the North;
we hear constantly of new sects in that denomination, as one class after
her of visionary enthusiasts among them rallies around some new hobby.
sm is their sin, and schism is their punishment.

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES TURNED PROPHET.

rchbishop Hughes has lately been publishing to the world, that the English
n seems about to relapse into Popery, and that Romish priests at no distant
will be seen celebrating their rites in the noble old Cathedrals of the English
rch. What he hopes to accomplish by such an outrageous and utterly ground-
prediction, is of course mere conjecture. Whether by such a feint he aims to
t attention from the Papacy, just now the object of abhorrence and the scorn of
Christendom for the iron despotism and the heartless bloody cruelties of its
t and designs, and all this, too, while sinking every year more and more into
less decrepitude, gnashing its toothless gums in impotent rage; or whether the
ıbishop hopes thus to cover the disgrace, that multitudes of its members and its
erts are fleeing from that apostate Church in utter disgust; or whether he is
ıg, simply, to throw dust into the eyes of Romanists here in this land of free
ght, we do not know. But the following extract from a late Romish paper in
and show what the Romanists there think of the English Church.
ıe writer sets out with "the fact, that from some cause or other, the (Roman)
olic faith has as yet made no wide or deep impression on the mass of English
lievers." He says, "whatever in England is most serious, whatever is most
id, whatever is best informed as to the Bible, as to Religious Doctrines and
esiastical History, keeps itself apart (from Romanists) with a jealous horror."
he adds, "as a mass, the English nation remains untouched." * * * * "it is
ange and portentous sight, this English Protestant life." * * * * "The wonder
the Protestant Churches and Chapels which cover the land by thousands and
of thousands; and in the inexplicable state of the multitudes who frequent
e places Sunday after Sunday, with Bibles in their hands, listening to sermons
ining a large mixture of truth with error, uttering prayers in which orthodoxy
ı far predominates over heresy, cultivating sedulously the domestic and honor-
virtues, laboring benevolently for the poor and the suffering, and even, we
d hope, many of them, not passing a day without sincere, heartfelt secret
er to God through Jesus Christ."
ıe change which has come over the English Church in the last twenty-five
s, the new life, vitality and power with which she is meeting the exigencies of
ıge, are simply marvellous.

HENRY WARD BEECHER AND THE INDEPENDENT.

s Henry Ward Beecher is a "representative man," we propose to devote a
graph or two to him. The (Boston Congregational) *Puritan Recorder*, of late
has the following:

"What we have, with sad forebodings, long expected, is now realized, in Mr. Beecher's open abandonment of the doctrine of the inevitable and eternal perdition of ungodly men. The secret of his fraternizing with Chapin and Parker is now fully explained in his open avowal of the main principle of Universalism—which is, that all the Scriptural assertions of the sure and eternal punishment of the wicked, fail to make us know that they will thus be punished."

The following paragraph from one of his discourses shows clearly enough where the man stands.

"One thing I know, and that is, that there is no other name but the name of Christ, given under heaven, *that we know anything about*, whereby we must be saved. * * For he who lives and dies, believing in Christ, shall not perish, but have everlasting life. *Whether any other shall have everlasting life or not, is not for you or me to say.* I will not sit in judgment upon them, neither will I set up a judgment against them."

The following passage from one of his recent "Discourses," is also going the round of the political press of the country.

"Don't take your Bible and say, 'I don't want to read it, but I suppose I must.' nor your hymn book and say, 'I don't want to sing, but I guess I had better;' don't say, 'I don't want to pray, but I will, and keep praying till I do feel like it.' I am in the habit of likening the Saviour in my thoughts, to some great and noble friend—don't you suppose if you went to the door of such a friend and said to him, 'I did not want to see you a bit to-day, but I was afraid you would feel hurt if I did not come, and would treat me accordingly,' that he would say, 'If you don't want to see me, I am sure I don't want to see you,' and do you suppose that God is less delicate in friendship than an earthly friend? I don't suppose a man would sin unpardonably if he did not read the Bible any for a whole day. I don't believe God sits watching every man, and saying, 'There! he has not read the Bible for twenty-four hours! Put that down against him!' And we ought not to read the Bible for fear of any such accounting." Theatre-going, and public amusements of all sorts, he treats in the same way.

This is a fair specimen of Henry Ward Beecher's so-called theology. It is a mere Naturalism *versus* Supernaturalism. The instincts, promptings, desires, will of man's fallen, unrenewed nature, are to be his guide and rule of life; instead of the Revealed Will of God. If that rule applies to one moral duty, it applies to all, and of course to the whole Moral Law, and to each one of the Ten Commandments. The inevitable effect of such miserable shallow quackery on the public conscience and public morals of the nation is obvious. It would, and will, if unresisted, make heathens of us all, and this, too, under the guise of a pretended philanthropy; and hence, we need to lift the garb from this "angel of light" and show the cloven foot.

But this is not all. The *Independent* (newspaper) has already become the organ of the rabid, disorganizing radicalism of the country. One of Henry Ward Beecher's Sermons appears in each number of that paper. Always Abolition in its character, it has already entered the next Presidential campaign as a violent party political paper, and is now seeking circulation among Churchmen by engaging as a stated contributor to its columns, a prominent Presbyter of the Church, the Rev. Dr. S. H. Tyng. The great mass of Churchmen will see at a glance the object of this game, and are in no danger of admitting such a fire-brand into their houses;

ut a word of caution may not be out of place. The whole subject is suggestive, nd a word to the wise is sufficient. But they who are striving to build up among s a system of eclectic, irresponsible Voluntaryism, in order to take the Church's ork out of her hands, would do well to sit down first and count the cost.

As a specimen of the *Independent's* malignant Anti-Church spirit, we quote its ecent notice of the venerable "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign arts." It says: "This is the oldest Missionary Society, enjoys the patronage of e High-Church dignitaries, and has a large income, say $600,000 annually. It as three hundred missionaries, supplemented by school masters, catechists and ripture readers. It is an affecting fact, that this old and strong society for the ropagation of the Gospel,' propagates another Gospel, which is not another, and inimical to the Cross of Christ. Its Gospel is prelacy and clerical authority. It sists that men shall be called master, and that rites and observances taught and actised by the proper masters of ceremonies avail everything. The essential irit of Popery pervades the Society, and its secretary, the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, as one of the earliest adherents to the new Oxford apostacy."

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. Thomas Musgrave, Archbishop of York, died ay 4th, at his residence in Belgrave-square. He was a native of Cambridge, here he was born in 1788. He received his education at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he became fourteenth Wrangler and B.A. in 1810, Members' Prizeman in 1811 and 1812, and M.A. in 1813. He was ordained deacon in 1816 by the ishop of Bristol, and priest in the following year by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. bout the same time he was elected Fellow of Trinity College, and in 1820 Lord lmoner's Professor of Arabic. The latter post he held till 1837, when he was minated Dean of Bristol in the place of the Rev. Dr. Henry Beeke, and was nomated the same year by the late Viscount Melbourne to the See of Hereford, which d become vacant by the death of the Hon. Edward Grey. From this See Dr. usgrave was translated, in 1847, to the Archiepiscopacy of York, void by the dease of the Hon. Edward V. Harcourt. The works published under his name are follows: *Sermon* for the S. P. G., (preached in St. Paul's Cathl.) 8vo, Lond. 1844. *Charge* (to the Clergy of Hereford), ib. 1845. *Sermons for the Ch. Miss. Soc.*, rinted in the Soc.'s Proceedings), ib. 1849–50. *A Charge* (to the Clergy of York), 1849. *A Second Charge*, ib. 1853.

The Rt. Rev. CHARLES THOMAS LONGLEY, D.D., Bishop of Durham, has been ppointed Archbishop of York. He is in his 66th year, was consecrated to the new se of Ripon in 1836 in 1856 was translated to the See of Durham, and is the nior Bishop of the Province; which includes the Sees of Durham, Carlisle, hester, Manchester, Ripon, Sodor and Man. The Diocese of York comprises the hole of Yorkshire, with the exception of a portion belonging to the See of Ripon, d is of the annual value of £10,000.

NEW BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

In the April *Review*, we reported the nomination of the Rev. C. J. Vaughan to the vacant See of Rochester. His *nolo episcopari* has led to the appointment of the Venerable Joseph Cotton Wigram, M.A., Archdeacon of Winchester, and Rector of St. Mary's, Southampton:

The Rev. gentleman was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1819 as sixth Wrangler. He was ordained deacon in 1822, and priest in 1823; was for some years curate of St. James's Church, Piccadilly; and in 1839 was presented to the rectory of East Tested, near Alton, Hampshire. In 1847 he was appointed to the archdeaconry of Winchester, and upon the resignation of the living of Southampton by Lord Guildford, in 1850, the Bishop nominated Archdeacon Wigram to it, and he has held it up to the present time.

We are sometimes amused at the frankness with which Englishmen write and speak in such matters. The *Guardian* thus characterizes the appointment. "The nomination of Archdeacon Wigram to the See of Rochester is not a good one, nor on the other hand is it conspicuously bad. A respectable clergyman of good fortune, tolerably active habits, a fair capacity for business, Low Church opinions (but not, we believe, narrow or intolerant)—in short, distinguished for nothing in particular, his appointment is one of those which Lord Palmerston evidently considers most desirable for the Church. There is room, however, to regret the *nolo episcopari* of Dr. Vaughan."

NEW DEAN OF RIPON.

The Rev. William Goode, rector of St. Margaret, Lothbury, has been appointed to the Deanery of Ripon, in the room of the very Rev. T. Garnier.

MISSIONARY SOCIETIES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The Anniversary Meeting of the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, was held at St. James's Hall, on Monday, April 30th; the Archbishop of Canterbury taking the chair. The other Bishops present were the Bishops of Chichester, St. Asaph, Llandaff, Carlyle, Down and Connor, Labuan and Brisbane. The Bishop of London and Sir George Grey were amongst those who sent letters of apology. It was mentioned incidentally in the report, that St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, has sent out to missionary work, upwards of fifty clergymen; and that two Roman Catholic priests in India had conformed to the Church of England. The funds of the society continue to be satisfactory: its income for the year was $577,150. Besides the Bishops of Down and Connor, and Labuan, Lord Robert Cecil, Dr. Phillimore, and Mr. Beresford-Hope supported the resolutions by speeches. As the Society operates to a large extent in connection with Colonial organizations, the missionary results are not so readily ascertained, but they are upon a grand scale, and the Society was never more vigorous or successful than at the present day.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this Society was held on Tuesday, May 1st. The Earl of Chichester presided, and was supported by Lord Middleton, the Bishops of Win-

r, Carlisle, Llandaff, Ripon, and Sierra Leone; the Dean of Carlisle, Lieutenant el Edwardes, C.B., the Revs. C. Fines Clinton, C. Bridges, W. Cadman, F. J. B. Marsden, and others. The report stated the total receipts of the year 18,145. Immediately after the reading of the report, a cheque was handed in 000*l.*; the donor, who desired that his name might not be mentioned, wishing t might, if possible, be applied to the propagation of the Gospel in Japan. peakers were the Bishop of Winchester, Mr. Abel Smith, M.P., Lieutenant el Herbert Edwardes, the Rev. Clement Cobb, the Bishop of Sierra Leone, the Emilius Bayley, rector of Bloomsbury; the Dean of Carlisle, and the Rev. ı Miller, of Birmingham. The Report states that the whole number of Clergy Society's employ, is 236; and that, so far as the accounts had been made up, mber of communicants at the different stations is 19,480.

LIAMENTARY NEWS.—DEFEAT OF THE ANTI-CHURCH-RATE PARTY.

Parliament, the Bill for the abolition of Church-Rates, was ordered to a *third* ıg on Friday, May 4th, by a majority of only 9, in a House of 461 members. bruary the *second* reading was carried by a majority of 29. In 1859, the Bill arried by a majority of 74. The "*Nonconformist*," the organ of the Dissenters, "Upwards of sixty members have fallen away from our ranks since last They have not joined the minority—they have simply abstained from helping ke a majority. We shall not puzzle our brains, nor mislead our friends by pting to account for this result as a casuality. It is a defeat."

LITURGICAL REVISION.

d Ebury's motion for a Revision of the Prayer Book came up in the House of ı on the 8th of May. Already 10,000 or more Clergy have signed a declara- hat any attempt to alter the Prayer Book at the present time, would be dan- s to the peace and unity of the Church, and half as many more names might been obtained. Only about 400 Clergy have petitioned for a revision; and ist, small as it is, will not, it is said, bear close examination. Not a single p supported the motion; and after debate it was negatived without a division. Bishop of Oxford made a telling speech against the motion, and the Bishop of on gave it a hearty opposition.

DECLINE OF DISSENT IN ENGLAND.

e Bill now in Parliament providing for the next census in England has revealed lar facts respecting both the temper and the number of Dissenters. The last us, in which Churchmen took little interest, and Dissenters a great deal, was ken as to present a formidable front for Dissent; and the utter unfairness of whole thing was only disclosed in subsequent Parliamentary debates. Now, chmen are determined that, if any classification of this sort is made, it shall be correctly; and the *Nonconformist* has come to the conclusion that "the ques- as to religious profession is an inquisitorial and impertinent inquiry into per- l opinions; that it will inflict annoyance, and that the replies will be partial delusive, and of no value." A writer in the *Literary Churchman* says, "It *is* a

fact, that the Methodists, the Baptists, the Independents, and the Unitarians, as well as the Mormonites, have all lost ground since the great revival of the Church began in 1833. First, then, *learning* is a cause of many Dissenters leaving dissent; some leave it for popery, some for the Church, some for infidelity; but the fact stands—they *are* leaving it. It is doubtful whether all the Protestant Dissenters of all England now, *strictly* speaking, amount to two millions and a-half. But the census of 1861 will test this; and the political Dissenters are in terror at the prospect of that census, and will "move heaven and earth" to defeat the ascertainment of the religious statistics, as they did in 1851."

In the United States the same process is going on, and to an extent not dreamed of. In certain, and the older portions of our country, Dissent is declining, not only relatively, but absolutely. The facts and causes, as well as the exceptions, are all worthy of consideration.

MISSIONS IN IRELAND.

On the 11th of April a meeting of the Irish Society was held in Dublin, under the presidency of the Earl of Mayo. This Society makes the Irish tongue, and the Irish Bible, and the Irish school, and the Irish teacher, and the Irish missionary, its main and *distinctive* instrumentalities. From the report of this meeting we gather the following items of information. The progress of the Society's operations during the past year seems to have been satisfactory. The agency now comprises 17 missionary clergymen, 2 lay agents, 78 Scripture readers, of whom 20 are inspectors of Irish schools, 16 mission schools in which 600 children are under instruction, 246 Irish schools in which 7,580 pupils are being taught to read the Irish Bible. The Committee states that the Church at Kilmalchedar, near Dingle, is at length about to be erected for the use of the converts of that Parish, where no church has been in existence since the Reformation.

The new Church of Cappamore was consecrated during the past year, which is the third church erected during the last four years in that neighborhood, all of which were called for by the successful labors of the Irish Society. The income of the Society for the past year from Ireland was 5,271*l*, and the English and Foreign contributions 3,512*l*, making a total of 8,783*l*. The meeting was addressed, among others, by the Rev. A. P. Hanlon, Vicar of Mountshannon, who gave a very interesting account of his advocacy of the Irish Society, during a visit which he paid, as a deputation from the Society, to the United States and Canada. Nothing could be more enthusiastic than the interest which the Bishops and Clergy of the Church in North America took in the working of the Society. Mr. Hanlon was invited to the General Convention of the whole American Church at Richmond; and, in the midst of a press of business, an evening was set apart for him to explain the proceedings of the Irish Society. Before he returned to Ireland he succeeded in organizing auxiliaries to the Society in seventy places in America; and the Rev. G. G. Gubbins, Rector of Ballingarry, has just sailed for the United States, in order to follow up the work which Mr. Hanlon has so successfully commenced.

IRISH CHURCH MISSION SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this Society was largely attended. On Sunday, April 15th, the Bishop of Ripon preached twice in Dublin in behalf of the Society, and

s an address at the Meeting. The speakers represented the circumstances of ociety as full of hope. The funds show a considerable increase over the last ; they amount to 23,085*l*, from England, and 4,650*l*, from Ireland. There are esent employed by the Society 29 missionaries, 152 readers, 58 schoolmasters, choolmistresses, 234 Irish and English teachers. The attendance upon the ay and daily schools has been 4,092 pupils. Satisfactory progress has been in the mission work in Connemara, Antrim and Cork. In Kilkenny the fierce of persecution has been considerably restrained.

SCOTLAND.—THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN AGAIN.

e Rt. Rev. A. P. Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, having been presented to the opal Synod by the Rev. William Henderson and others, for holding and teach- rroneous doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist, the case having been pa- y heard and elaborately argued, the sentence of the Synod was rendered on 5th of March. The Bishops present on the bench were,—The Primus, the p of Moray, the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and the Bishop of Glasgow. The p of Argyll was absent through illness.

the Presentment, it is charged that, by the Bishop,—I. "The doctrines of the ss of the oblation of Christ *finished* on the Cross, of the perfect propitiation h he there *once* made, and of the Holy Eucharist being a *memorial* or *commem-* n of His death and sacrifice on the Cross. * * * are contradicted.' Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross."—P. 41. words of man can strengthen the tremendous and absolute identity of the two ifices," or "of the one Sacrifice in its two aspects.'—P. 42. As "Christ *is* the itiation for our sins," "if the Body of our Lord be in any sense in the Eucharist, st plead" and "be precious in the eyes of the Father," and "act according to n law," and "effect its end."—P. 53. II. "He contradicts and depraves the 28th Article, and the * * Declaration of the Book of Common Prayer." reme adoration is due to the Body and Blood of Christ mysteriously present in ifts." "The worship is due, not to the gifts, but to Christ in the gifts.—Pp. 27, III. "He contradicts the doctrine of the 28th Article * * and * * 29th le." "It is enough to believe," that, in regard to the use of the Lord's Supper, ome sense the wicked do receive Christ indeed, to their condemnation and loss." 26.

e Bishops delivered their individual opinions, and at great length; the reading e paper of the Bishop of St. Andrew's occupied about three hours. We give nanimous Sentence of the Court in full.

e CLERK (the Bishop of Glasgow) then read the following, as the unanimous ng of the Court:—

At Edinburgh, the 15th day of March, 1860, the College of Bishops, having re- d consideration of the Presentment, at the instance of the Rev. William Hen- n, incumbent of St. Mary's Church, Arbroath, Patrick Wilson, a vestryman of ary's Church, Arbroath, and David Smith, a vestryman, also of St. Mary's ch, Arbroath, being members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, against the ev. Alexander Penrose Forbes, D. C. L., Bishop of Brechin, complaining of the ing and doctrines contained in the Charge delivered by the said Bishop to the y of his Diocese, on the 5th of August, 1857, and thereafter published and re- shed by his authority; and having heard parties fully thereon, find that the

said Presentment is relevant, and proven to the extent and effect after mentioned: and more particularly find, with reference to the charges contained under the first and second heads of the Presentment, as set forth at pages 2, 3 and 4 thereof, that the teaching of the Respondent, therein complained of, is unsanctioned by the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and is, to a certain extent, inconsistent therewith. Find that the third charge of the Presentment, as set forth on page 4 thereof, is not proven. Find, with reference to the concluding charge of said Presentment, embracing the particulars marked with the letters *a*, *b* and *c*, that the passage in the Respondent's Charge, complained of under the letter *b*, has been withdrawn by the Respondent, and that the charges, under the letters *a* and *c*, have been in substance disposed of by the foregoing finding, applicable to the second head of the Presentment. But, in consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the Respondent in his answers, in reference to the first charge, and in consideration also that the Respondent now only asks toleration for his opinions, but does not claim for them the authority of the Church or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction, we, the said College of Bishops, feel that we shall best discharge our duty in this painful case, by limiting our sentence to a declaration of censure and admonition. And we do now solemnly admonish, and in all brotherly love entreat, the Bishop of Brechin to be more careful for the future, so that no fresh occasion may be given for trouble and offence, such as have arisen from the delivery and publication of the Primary Charge to his Clergy, complained of in the Presentment. And we declare the proceedings in this case to be now concluded."

The Synod, after having disposed of some private business, was dissolved.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

On the 16th of April, the Rt. Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M. P., was installed Rector of this University, and delivered an able Address on the character and scope of Universities, and their place in the scheme of Christian Civilization. It ought to be republished and widely circulated in this country, and especially among those who are connected with our Colleges and so-called Universities.

THE PEOPLE AND THE POPE IN ROME. THE POPE'S BULL.

Romish ecclesiastics in the United States are so persistent in their assertions of the paternal character of the Papal Government in Italy, and of the happiness of the people under him, that the following important Table is valuable. It is made up from reliable returns. It should be said, that the Emperor Napoleon's plan for the settlement of Italy was, that the Duchies of Parma and Modena should be at once annexed to Piedmont; Tuscany to be erected into a separate Kingdom, under a prince chosen by the people; the States of the Church to form a Vicariate, and placed under the sovereignty of the Pope. Victor Emanuel, however, King of Sardinia, determined to appeal to the people whether they would, or would not, be annexed to Piedmont. In the early part of March a vote was taken, and with the following developments of the popular will:

TUSCANY.	For annexation,		366,571	For separate Kingdom,			14,925
Modena.	"	"	115,621	"	"	"	
Parma.	"	"	88,511	"	"	"	
The Romagna.	"	"	202,659	"	"	"	254

hus on a popular vote, in a country overrun with Romish priests, and with the ter Excommunication hanging over their heads, the Papal pretensions have been ned and rejected with almost entire unanimity. What surprises us is, that n the popular vote was taken, the Romish clergy and the Religious Orders are sented as leading their flocks to the polls; and when subsequently the King red Florence in triumph, the Archbishop and his Chapter met the new Sover- at the door of the Cathedral, and was the first to intone the *Te Deum*. Ex- these facts as we may, such is Romanism at head quarters. The outrages ist humanity, perpetrated by the Papal Government, would astonish the world y were generally known. The Papacy in all its forms and pretensions, eccle- ical and civil, is a stupendous imposition,—an outrage on all right, human and e; begotten by ambition, and nurtured by violence and fraud, it deserves the ration of the people which is so emphatically visited upon it.

hile these events are taking place in Northern and Central Italy, Naples is on ve of insurrection; distinguished Neapolitans are arrested, banished or impris- on mere suspicion; and the Governments of England, France and Spain are ing the King to more moderate measures.

is worth noting, that the "*Freeman's Journal*," at New York, a Romish News- r on American soil, lately declared that "Sardinia is the bane and the foe of ical Liberty in Italy."

the 29th of March, the Pope issued his Bull of the greater Excommunica- not only against the Sardinian Government; it is evidently intended for Na- n III. also, though he is not named personally; nor indeed is anybody else. assertion of spiritual and temporal power over Kings and Kingdoms, and this nciation of the Curses of God on them, deserves the careful consideration of ans as well as theologians. What the French Emperor thinks of this new Bull be seen in the following, which appeared in *The Moniteur* of Apr. 1st:

The Government considers it to be its duty, under existing circumstances, to to mind the following disposition of the organic laws of the Concordat:—

'No bull, brief, rescript, decree, mandate, provision, signature serving for pro- n, nor other missive of the Court of Rome, even only regarding private individ- can be received, published, printed, or otherwise put in execution without the ority of the Government.'"

SARDINIA UNDER THE NEW ARRANGEMENT.

he Kingdom of Sardinia, as it existed before the war, embraced, with its de- lent islands, an area of 22,102 miles, in which lived a population of 4,650,368.

he following-named territory accrued to Sardinia as the result of the late war:

he province of Lombardy, of 8,538 square miles, and a population of 2,380,635 s, the principal city being Milan; the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, with an area of 45 square kilometres, [a thousand kilometres are 3,280 feet.] and a popu- n of 1,807,000 souls; the principal cities being Florence, with a population bout 114,000, Leghorn, about 80,000, Sienna, 21,000, Lucca, 22,000, Pisa, 25,000; Duchy of Parma, with an area of 5,872 square kilometres, and 507,000 souls; principal cities being Parma, with 41,000 inhabitants, and Piacenza, with 29,000; Duchy of Modena, with an area of 6,036 kilometres, and a population of 605,194 ls; the chief cities, Modena, with 32,000, and Reggio, with 19,000, inhabitants. four legations, which have thrown off the Papal yoke, number a little over a mil-

lion of inhabitants, with Bologna as the chief city, the population of that place amounting to about 75,000.

The total population of Central Italy amounts to 3,933,299, which, added to the population of Sardinia proper and Lombardy, would make in round numbers 12,000,000. After deducting Nice and Savoy, the present population of the United Kingdom of Central Italy may be set down at 11,200,000, while the territory on which this vast population lives, includes the most thriving portion of Italy, and some of the most elegant and remarkable cities in the world.

FRANCE AND SAVOY AND NICE.

By special treaty, the Municipalities of Savoy and Nice have been transferred from Sardinia to France. France thus possesses Savoy up to Mont Cenis, and Nice up to Villefranche, inclusive. After the bargain was made for the territories, a popular vote was taken! which resulted in an almost unanimous vote for the annexation.

ULTRAMONTANISM IN FRANCE.

The French Newspaper, the *Univers*, the organ of the Ultramontanists, was suppressed on the 29th of Jan. The Emperor has entered in earnest upon the work of resistance to the ultra-power; first, in suppressing the *mandements* of the bishops after the war; next, by the prohibition to circulate the Veuillot address from the Clergy to the Pope, because of its incendiary character; then by a warning, now followed by the final suppression of the most eloquent and devoted of the Ultramontanists.

On the other hand, however, in all the Churches of Paris, the priests, by order of the Archbishop of Paris, read the last encyclical letter from the Pope. The Archbishop also ordered public prayers to be offered until Easter, in order that His Holiness may overcome the tribulations to which the Church is now exposed.

The Government will never have peace until it drives the Jesuits, *ei et armis*, from its dominions; and for this it has better precedent than for some other things it has already ventured upon. It will, however, do well to look out for the stiletto and the slow poison. These used to be great arguments with Jesuits; and Romanism, they say, never changes.

PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH IN INDIA.

Not unfrequently, writers of the Madame Pfeiffer stamp, in returning from the East, tell us that they saw nothing of the progress of the Gospel. The present Bishop of Calcutta, in his late Charge, has the following:—

"Seventy years ago, the subject of Missions was regarded in England, no less than in India, as a pure absurdity. A Bishop assured the House of Lords, that the obligation to convert the heathen had ceased from the days of the Apostles, and the proposal to preach the Gospel among barbarous nations, was denounced in the General Assemby of the Scotch Church as highly preposterous. In 1807, England was agitated by a pamphlet from one Indian official, declaring that the mere existence of the Bible Society placed our Eastern possessions in a situation of imminent and ur-

precedented peril, while another asserted that the mind of man had never conceived a wilder and more dangerous plan than that of instituting free schools throughout Hindustan. In 1812, a Missionary to British India could find no rest for the sole of his foot, except in the Danish settlement of Serampore, or the heathen kingdom of Ava. In 1813, Warren Hastings, the greatest of proconsuls, complacently told the House of Commons, that he could 'remember a worthy gentleman who bore the character of a Missionary, Mr. Schwartz, in the Carnatic,' and that he had heard of the conversion of one Indian. In the same year, a Member of Parliament, who had been twenty years in India, publicly declared that the Hindu religion was pure and unexceptionable; and even to send out a Bishop and Clergy for the benefit of Europeans was regarded as dangerous. In 1829, the rite of Suttee was protected by law. In 1839, the Government still derived a revenue from the obscene impieties of the Jugganâth festival. Now, in this single year, 1859, the English Government, under the advice and direction of Lord Stanley, the very minister whose deeds and words have been so severely criticised, has ordered the gradual but speedy suppression of the cruelties practised at the Charak Puja, has forbidden the executive to superintend the fulfillment of trusts for idolatrous purposes, and has refused to recognize heathenism in courts of justice by the forms of administering oaths. These acts should, in all fairness, be remembered, before we denounce the Government as unchristian. We can now plant Missions all over the country when and where we will; we can obtain Government help for schools, in which the Bible is taught to every scholar; we can bring our books and our teaching to bear on every class of the population."

So also the *Madras* Church Missionary Record records the recent ordination of eight native pastors, and says that, "through the blessing of God upon the advanced labors of our Tinnevelly Missionaries, the number of native clergymen in that part of our South India Mission is increased from nine to seventeen, in addition to six others connected with the Malayalim districts of Travancore.

"It was remarked by the Bishop of Madras, on the evening of the ordination, that 'never since the time of the Apostles had a Christian Bishop been privileged to take part in so solemn and interesting a service.'"

The Bishop of Madras during a recent tour in Travancore, confirmed upwards of eight hundred, and in Tinnevelly, of two thousand natives, in connection with the Missions.

THE ENGLISH AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

The following information, which we gather from an English paper, shows what great designs God, in His Providence, may be working out in our own day:

The Rev. Dr. Joseph Wolff, vicar of Isle Brewers, Somersetshire, well known for his erudition and labors in connection with the Church in the East, has been in correspondence with the Rev. George Williams, Senior Fellow of King's College, with reference to the establishment of hostels in Cambridge for members of the Armenian and Greek Churches. It appears that the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, the Armenian Catholicus of Etchmiazin, and other influential pastors, urged Dr. Wolff to establish a College at Isle Brewers. Several of their letters are quoted; amongst others the following:—

Wartanes Wardapiet, superior of the monastery at Kreym in Jebl Kesruan. "Wolff," he said, "you have been sent by God to assist us in building a College

for the instruction of our youth in our own theology, without distraction, so that we may not be compelled to be either followers of the Church of Rome, or followers of the Church of the English Sultan, for each Church has its peculiarities, only suited to herself in particular; we are, after all, brothers in Christ!"

Again:—

"In the year 1843, and again in 1845, the Armenian Archbishop of Ispahan, and other enlightened Armenians in Teheran, reminded me of my promise to assist the Armenians, in connection with the Jacobites, to establish such a College in the place where I reside; and they added, 'that there is in England a great priest, *Keork* (*George*) *Williams*, a pious and learned man, who was in Jerusalem, who will certainly unite with you *in giving us every assistance in his power.*' In Tabreez the Russian Consul-General and all the Russian Attachés spoke of you and William Palmer in the highest terms, as also Count T—— and Prince D—— at Constantinople, and the Greek and Armenian Patriarchs; and Greek Archimandrites said, 'Joseph Wolff, forget us not whenever you come to England, and don't forget our College; we will send young men from six years of age to twenty, in order that instructed in England, they may return to their native land, and this will do more good than robbing us of our people by proselytising them, and thus creating a schism in the camp. Give our apostolic and brotherly blessing to *Keork Williams*.'"

Mr. Williams, writing to Dr. Wolff in full sympathy, expresses an opinion that Colleges or hostels in the University and preparatory schools at Isle Brewers, Somersetshire, will be the most effectual method of carrying out the "grand design." Mr. Williams also suggests, that two hostels should be established for the Greeks, which would be available for any Russians who might desire to enter, and another for the Armenians, which would also serve for their co-religionists, the Syrians, Copts and Ayssinians. He adds:—

"I must, in conclusion, express my conviction that the residue of both our lives —however long it may please God to spare us,—would be well devoted to this undertaking; and I will state some of the grounds of this conviction.

"It is fifteen years since I first published my opinion, which I now know is shared by you, that, if ever the Armenian Church should be awakened to a sense of its responsibility, and replenished with the Holy Ghost, it would be in a more advantageous position than any Church in Christendom to propagate the faith of Christ throughout the East, owing to its wide diffusion among all the nations of Asia and of Eastern Europe. What a blessed privilege would it be, should our English Universities be permitted to forward a consummation so devoutly to be wished, by preparing the members of that Church for the great work which is before them!

"But you mention also the Abyssinians; and this touches us more nearly at this moment, when God's providence is not only opening the continent of Africa to Missionary enterprise in such a marvellous manner, but also directing the special attention of our two Universities to the extension of the Gospel on the eastern side of that peninsula. How would it strengthen the hands of my friend, Archdeacon Mackenzie, had we now in this University a band of Abyssinian students prepared to cast in their lot with him, and to engage the hearty sympathy and co-operation of their national Church in his great work; perhaps, also, to occupy, in friendly concert with his Mission, that vast field south of the Lake Nyanza, so recently opened by Captain Speke, in a part of the continent not so very remote from the southern frontier of their ancient kingdom, and, for Africa, contiguous to the probable field

ur projected mission on the banks of the River Shire and the shores of Lake wa."

a postscript, Mr. Williams mentions that "a very distinguished Russian noble- has lately signified to me his wish to send his eldest son to this University; I have no doubt, that, in the event of the establishment of a hostel, many Rus- would avail themselves of it." Dr. Wolff adopts Mr. Williams' views, which, tates, he shall immediately communicate to the Armenian and Greek Patriarchs. stablishing the proposed hostels, Dr. Wolff argues that the English Church will efully adopting a precedent of the Roman, which has not only sent learned ts among the Armenians, but has invited them to build Colleges in Rome itself, g them "every possible privilege, that they may carry on their whole service e old way, under their own director or superior, never obliging them to rm to the ritus of the Latin Church, but permitting them to retain the old Ar- an ritus, and never obliging them to submit to the decrees of the Council of t, but only to promise obedience to the Summo Pontifici."

E COUNCIL OF NICÆA, ITS CREED, THE PASCHAL DECREE, AND THE CANONS.

the January No. of the London "*Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Rec-* " there is a valuable Essay on "Recent Syriac Literature." It contains notices rofessor Lamy's "Dissertation on the Faith and Discipline of the Syrian Church ference to the Eucharist," appended to which are the "Resolutiones Canonicæ" ohn of Tela and Jacob of Edessa; the former being now for the first time edited. most interesting part of the Essay is that which relates to some "extracts" ch have been lithographed, but not published, from a Syriac MS. in the Impe- Library in Paris, which was discovered by the learned editor of the "Analecta ana." The MS. contains a connected account of the proceedings of the Coun- f Nicæa, its acts and decisions. It commences with a statement of the time and mstances under which the Council was summoned, thus: "Again; of the great holy œcumenical synod of 318 holy Fathers, which was held at Nicæa, &c., &c. 13th before the kalends of July, in the 20th year of the lover of Christ, the t Constantine, the faithful King, who, when these fathers were first assembled ncyra of Galatia, called them thence by his epistle to them, which is this." n follows the epistle convoking the bishops, and then the creed which they pted as a confession of the faith, to which all unanimously agreed, but which a of the bishops did not sign. The MS. accounts for this by the statement that he Oriental bishops subscribed to it, but some few of the Western bishops did because no suspicion of heterodoxy attached to them, for "they confessed that Father is one truly, and the only Son is one truly, and the Holy Spirit is one y." At the close of the creed, the MS. says: "This is the creed which the hers adopted; first against Arius, who blasphemed and said the Son of God was reature; but afterwards against all heresies,—viz., of Sabellius and Plotinus, against the heresies of Paul of Samosata, and of Manes and Valentinus and cion, and against all other heresies against the Catholic Church." Then follow anathemas against the various heresies, and the celebrated Paschal decree re- g to the time for keeping Easter. This decree was only very recently discov- in Greek, and was published by Dom Pitra. The Syriac version is now found,

which coincides with that previously brought to light. There are also given in this MS. the twenty canons which were defined in the great and holy synod of Nicæa.

We are indebted for this abstract of the article to the "*London Clerical Journal.*"

MONSIEUR BEDINI AGAIN.

In the course of our present No. we have taken occasion to refer to the significant visit to this country of this Archbishop of Thebes, (?) and Nuncio to Brazil, (?) and to the remarkable celerity with which he found it convenient to sneak out of the country, and leave a broad margin between himself and his old Italian acquaintances. It should not be forgotten, that having arrived safely in the old world, and meanwhile "nursed his wrath to keep it warm," he proceeded, under date of Feb. 17, to send a missive to the "Archbishop of Baltimore," which, as a climax of blundering policy and ridiculous imbecility, and of smothered rage and mortification, still deserves to be remembered as one of the curiosities of the times. It clearly betrayed the evident fact, that his Mission to the United States had some master-stroke of public policy in view, in which respect both he and his Masters, doubtless, would have learned a lesson if they had been capable of it. His visit to this country aroused a hostility to Popery in this country which half a century cannot dispel. Anti-papal organizations, secret but determined, at once sprang up, and mobs have multiplied all over the country, for which M. Bedini may hold himself mainly responsible. But the funniest, or the stupidest thing in his letter, was his announcement of a gift of "a number of pictures of the Blessed Virgin of Rimini," "*the portentous moving of whose pupils*" has rendered it "a picture so blessed and so full of celestial inspiration." We somewhat doubt, whether this Lady of Rimini has "worked the prodigy of opening the eyes" of the Americans, in the way he intended; as the humbug of this "winking picture" is a little too gross even for many of the Romanists themselves to swallow. We would publish the Letter as a curiosity, except for its insipidity. We refer to the whole matter, to show under what auspices Popery has been planted and nurtured in these United States.

ENGLISH COLONIAL EPISCOPATE AND CHURCH GROWTH.

The London *Colonial Church Chronicle*, for August, 1859, has the following historical sketch, which we give entire.—Ed. Am. Qu. Ch. Rev.

WHIT-TUESDAY, 1841 AND 1859.

We incur no risk of being charged with exaggeration when we say, that the eighteen years comprised within the two days above specified, have done more for the stability and extension of the Church of England, not only than any period of equal, but than any period of twice, or four times the duration since the era of the Reformation. Possibly this assertion might be made good with reference to the erection of Churches and Church schools, and the vast improvement in Church education at home.

In this Journal, however, we look mainly to one special indication of the life of the Church,—the growth of our Missions, and the multiplication of our Colonial Sees. What, then, has been the progress of the Colonial Episcopate between 1841 and 1859? It may be as well, perhaps, for the better understanding of this great move-

ment, to bring under the eyes of our readers the first authoritative statement on the subject. It is as follows:—

"At a meeting of Archbishops and Bishops, held at Lambeth, on Tuesday, in Whitsun Week, 1841, the following Declaration was agreed to by all present:—

"We, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, contemplate with deep concern the insufficient provision which has been hitherto made for the spiritual care of the members of our National Church residing in the British Colonies, and in distant parts of the world, especially as it regards the want of a systematic superintendence of the Clergy, and the absence of those ordinances, the administration of which is committed to the Episcopal order. We therefore hold it to be our duty, in compliance with the Resolutions of a Meeting, convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the 27th of April last, to undertake the charge of the Fund for the Endowment of Additional Bishoprics in the Colonies, and to become responsible for its application.

"On due consideration of the relative claims of those Dependencies of the Empire which require our assistance, we are of opinion, that the immediate erection of Bishoprics is much to be desired in the following places:—New Zealand, the British Possessions in the Mediterranean, New Brunswick, Cape of Good Hope, Van Diemen's Land, Ceylon.

"When competent provision shall have been made for the Endowment of these Bishoprics, regard must be had to the claims of Sierra Leone, British Guiana, South Australia, Port Philip, Western Australia, Northern India, Southern India.

"In the first instance, we propose that an Episcopal See be established at the seat of Government in New Zealand, offers having been already made which appear to obviate all difficulty as to Endowment.

"Our next object will be to make a similar provision for the congregations of our own communion, established in the islands of the Mediterranean, and in the countries bordering upon that sea; and it is evident that the position of Malta is such as will render it the most convenient point of communication with them, as well as with the Bishops of the ancient Churches of the East, to whom our Church has been for many centuries known only by name."

Such was the project,—a large and comprehensive one undoubtedly,—which eighteen years ago was set before the great body of the Church of England. Let us now, as succinctly as possible, state the results.

The Declaration proclaims the necessity of a Bishop for New Zealand, and in the same year a Bishop was consecrated. There are now in those islands a Metropolitan Bishop and four Suffragans.

The Declaration shows the need of a Bishop to visit the chaplains and congregations of the Church of England in the Mediterranean, and in 1842 the Bishop of GIBRALTER was consecrated to this work.

New Brunswick was separated from Nova Scotia, and formed into the diocese of Fredericton in 1845.

For the Cape of Good Hope not one, but four Bishops have been appointed, and this diocese too has been formed into a province.

A Bishop has been sent to Van Diemen's Land, and another to Ceylon; and so the claims of the first list drawn up by the Archbishops and Bishops were abundantly satisfied within four years of its publication.

The next five provinces mentioned as requiring the superintendence of resident Bishops, viz., Sierra Leone, British Guiana, South Australia, Port Philip, (Victoria,) and Western Australia, have long since been erected into Bishoprics. Rarely, therefore, if we stopped at this point, has any great scheme been so rapidly and so fully carried out as that for the erection and endowment of additional Colonial Bishoprics. But much more has been done than was originally contemplated; and the best way of showing this, is by appending a Table of the Dioceses which have been constituted since the Declaration was signed on Whit-Tuesday, 1841.

New Zealand,	1841	Sierra Leone,	1850
Gibraltar,	1842	Graham's Town,	1853
Antigua,	1842	Natal,	1853
Guiana,	1842	Mauritius,	1854
Tasmania,	1842	Labuan,	1855
Fredericton,	1845	Christ Church, New Zealand,	1856
Colombo,	1845	Perth, West Australia,	1857
Capetown,	1847	Huron, Canada,	1857
Newcastle,	1847	Wellington, New Zealand,	1858
Melbourne,	1847	Nelson,	1858
Adelaide,	1847	Waiapu,	1859
Victoria,	1849	Columbia,	1859
Rupert's Land,	1849	Brisbane, Australia,	1859
Montreal,	1850	St. Helena,	1859

Thus, then, within eighteen years between the Declaration which was signed on Whit-Tuesday, 1841, and the consecration of the Bishops of Brisbane and St. Helena on Whit-Tuesday last, *twenty-eight* additional bishoprics have been founded in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown—a number, that is, of new Sees exactly equal to the total number of English and Welsh Dioceses.

We may perhaps take another opportunity of tracing the beneficial consequences of this great movement, in the increase of the settled and missionary Clergy—the establishment of schools—the marking out of parishes—and the settlement, in many of the Dioceses, of a regular Church constitution and government, by a synod consisting of Bishop, Clergy and laity.

It will not, however, have escaped attention, that while bishoprics have sprung up with such wonderful rapidity in the various provinces of our great colonial empire, the wants of India, both North and South, though prominently set forth in the Lambeth Declaration, remain to the present day unsatisfied.

It was never, we believe, contemplated that these Sees, thus formally proclaimed to be necessary for the welfare of the Indian Church, should be endowed in the same way as those in British colonies—by voluntary contributions. Such a proposition, while it might have been regarded as an imputation on the liberality of the great East Indian Company, would have been open to objections as an unreasonable demand upon the pockets of English Church people.

But other difficulties also stood in the way. An act of Parliament would probably be required for the sub-division of the present Indian Dioceses. According to the scale of Indian salaries, an endowment, five or six times the amount of what is thought sufficient for a British colony, would be required for an Indian Bishopric. But, even if an adequate endowment were provided by private subscriptions, the same mode of appointment which is allowed for a Colonial See, would hardly be approved where the subordinate Clergy would consist in chief part of chaplains nominated by the Government. These objections, not, we trust, insuperable, are

pposed to have delayed, at least, the required additions to the Episcopate in dia. But one See has, it is understood, been virtually promised for the North-st Province. Another, surely, is required for the Punjab; and whatever diffi-ties may stand in the way of such a measure, it will be impossible much longer verlook the claims of that remarkable mission-ground of Tinnevelly for a Bish-of its own.

THE "LONDON TIMES" AND THE "JOHN BULL."

he *Times* Newspaper, which scoffed like an infidel at the erection of new Bish-ics, thus vents its spleen at the Clergy of the Church.

If the Clergy were treated only as the members of every other public or private fession; if they were made to do their daily work and render an account of it heir superiors in Church and State; and if they were paid and promoted with ie regard to their work and qualifications, the work would soon be done—they ald themselves improve; and wealthy men, as well as many who are not althy, would subscribe readily and largely for a work which they would feel to a reality, and no sham, &c., &c."

o all this the "*John Bull*" thus replies: "But to return to the Clergy and their k, and to the question, how they can be made to do it effectually. 'The remedy lain'—all that is wanted is 'the courage to apply it.' Let the Clergy be 'made lo their daily work, and render an account of it to their superiors in Church and te,' and let them be promoted accordingly. Picture the model parson of the es, the 'man of common sense,' who is swayed by no visionary motives, but by stantial considerations, making out a daily return of the performance of his ritual functions, for transmission to some central board in Whitehall, to be duly ulated by clerks in a blue book, after the fashion of the reports of the Registrar-neral, and of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. Rebuked x sinners, and y , in z hours—average n sins per head, and n sinners per hour. Comforted the ken-hearted—x sick, y aged, z poor and needy, a distressed in mind, b afflicted ody, c distressed in estate—total of persons comforted, n; of sorrows soothed, total of hours employed, n; average per hour, of sorrows, n; of sufferers, n. d, Old Testament, New Testament, in English, in Hebrow, in Greek, x chapters, erses; noted down z texts for sermons; Fathers, Greek, Latin, folio, royal octa-common octavo, x pages; English Divines, folio, octavo, duodecimo, x pages; de x extracts, amounting to y lines, in z hours—average per hour n. Meditated ours, number of thoughts y—at n thoughts per hour. Made prayers, supplica-s, intercessions, for the Queen, for the Church, for self, for parishioners—in all etitions, y persons interceded for, in z hours—average n petitions per hour.' ncy these and all other clerical duties thus reduced to statistics, to be booked ly by the 'spiritual' laborer himself, for the information of his 'superiors in urch and State'—with an eye to promotion and increase of pay!—the *Times* ding of the clergy 'watching for men's souls, as they that must give account!'"

BEAUTIES OF THE ENDOWMENT SYSTEM.

A case has lately been before the Court of Queen's Bench, which shows the prac-al working of this system which our English brethren are fond of recommending us. The *London Morning Post*, comments thus: "We have frequently taken

occasion to point out the moral wrong and practical mischief arising out of the traffic that is perpetually going on in Church preferment. But we have seldom seen an instance more glaringly and painfully to the point, than that which was presented last Monday in the Court of Queen's Bench, in the case of Simpson v. Lamb. Without heaping together the hundred producible arguments against the sale of benefices, we may take our stand at once upon the simple proposition that the payment of a stipulated sum of money cannot spiritually confer a title to a clergyman to assume the cure of souls, and ought not to be allowed to do so legally. However, the reverse is the case, and any curate, no matter how mediocre his talents, how physically unfit, how practically inexperienced, may, if he can command a few thousand pounds, have his pick of a large number of eligible benefices in various parts of the country. The practice has become systematized; scales have been constructed, by which the present marketable value of a living can be calculated to a nicety. Agencies are established for the purpose of bringing venders and purchasers together, and effecting sales. Benefices are regularly advertised, like property of any other kind, and change hands with the same facility. It will occur at once to the right-minded reader that the sale of benefices is a violation of the responsibilities of patronage. He who holds the right to nominate a clerk to a benefice, holds a trust of the very gravest kind—a trust, in fulfillment of which he is solemnly bound to find the fittest man he can, to minister to the spiritual wants of the parishioners, who, be it remembered, are wholly at his mercy as to the kind of clergyman they are to have over them for perhaps the greater portion of their lives. The moment the thing is looked at from a layman's point of view, its iniquity is seen. The poor, the sick, the dying, the young, the afflicted, are in a special manner the objects for whose good the clergyman exists, and it must ever be a grave question to the head of a family, what kind of a man he is to whom his children may have to look for religious instruction, or whom he may have to call in to a death-bed, or any other of those solemn occasions when the parish priest is very properly, and, as a matter of course, sent for. Now, what a grievous wrong is done to the Church in cases where the patron invariably sells the next presentation. There are parishes in England that have never known an exemplary clergyman for fifty years, and some even longer. And if we search for the reason, we shall find it in the fact that the clergyman has always been the best of a number of bidders, and has been inducted without reference to clerical qualifications, but solely because he has paid the required sum to the patron, either by himself or through a friend. Some very excellent clergymen now labor exemplarily in parishes, the presentation to which would never have been theirs but for their pecuniary ability to pay their way to it. But these are the exception. As a general rule, no man buys a living who has a chance of getting one in any other way. Take the list of clergymen whose livings are sequestered for rent, or who are under suspension for immorality, and, though we rejoice to say they are rapidly decreasing in numbers, yet it will be found that the majority of them are men who have bought their way to the places they have disgraced. This fact alone is sufficient to condemn the system, if there be any truth in the proposition that 'a tree is known by its fruit.'"

STILL ANOTHER.

We find the following advertisement in a late *Ecclesiastical Gazette*: "To patrons. A Rector of "fourscore," residing on his Living, would accept eligible and valuable preferment. Address "Clericus," 9 Royal Parade, Cheltenham.'

le condescension! What disinterested kindness to the stranger will deign to accept, through sheer philanthropy, "eligible and valnt." Not for his own pleasure and advantage, for he exclaims in the arzillai, "I am this day fourscore years old; and can I discern bel evil?" (2 Samuel, xix, 35.) No, upon the very verge of the grave, selfish and worldly motives. He, in this respect, even exceeds what he Commandment. "He loves his neighbor 'better' than himself," se of nature, he (the venerable Clericus) must soon resign all subent, however eligible and valuable it may be—but the patron is ' advantaged; for the marketable value of this "eligible and valua-" is trebled, when the incumbent thereof has numbered so many equently so soon likely to become *pabulum Acherontis. O tempora,* e was when men were ashamed of "openly" transgressing ordidecencies of civilized life; but now they advertise their sins and

VERNACULAR BIBLE IN RUSSIA.

quently alluded to the providential indications that the Greek Church portant part in bringing in the latter-day glory of the Gospel. The *cal Journal* extracts from the St. Petersburgh paper, *Le Nord*, an oject recently set on foot in Russia for providing a vernacular edition iptures, to replace the Sclavonic version now in use. We give the he statement, which is made by a Moscow correspondent:—

raise this question in our day was Philaretes, the Metropolitan of he coronation of the Emperor Alexander, when most of our Archled at Moscow, it was decided that all the theological academies, as representatives of theological science in Russia, should be appealed this important work. The performance of it is now commenced by ment; as to the Old, it is proposed only to publish it in separate to be able to profit, on the publication of the entire Bible, by those which the translation will doubtless give rise. The first portion of nade its appearance. It is to be desired that there may be no delay ie last, that we may not be preceded by foreign presses, which have n a similar task. Without any doubt the new translation will be the Hebrew text, as well as with that of the Greek Septuagint, and riched with all the results of Biblical hermeneutics, in order to avoid h is unpardonable at our epoch. A negligent performance would be exatious, as it might cause the foreign undertaking to supersede it; ur Russian journals has judiciously remarked, "the frontiers of our onger those of our press." It is to be desired also that the translaits price, be within reach of everybody. The New Testament of the Society's edition is sold at the price of two francs. The Russian ot to cost more.

ent is only one of many indicating the social progress for which the or's reign is happily distinguished, and is in itself a strong contrast f the Emperor Nicholas, in the suppression of the Russian Bible ch the reigning Czar is said to be a munificent supporter. The *Cler-* ls:—

We are the more gratified to hear of the present enterprise, because the arbitrary conduct of the late Czar Nicholas has been often appealed to as a proof that the Greek Church is opposed to the distribution of the Scriptures among the people. Russia boasts the possession of some of the most precious manuscripts of the Bible known to exist, and among them the venerable Sinaitic Codex lately obtained by Dr. Tischendorf.

NEW FEATURE IN THE ANGLO-AFRICAN MISSION.

Having previously hailed with great pleasure the new Mission to Central Africa under the auspices of the English Universities, we notice lately a new feature in the Mission, as indicated in the following, from an English paper. "Great meetings in aid of missions to Central Africa had been held in Manchester and Liverpool. Lord Brougham was the principal speaker at both places, and urged that a vigorous support of the missions, which would indirectly encourage the production of cotton, would tend to suppress the slave trade and slavery." Considering the place, the speaker, the motives urged, and that the British Government has a hand in this new movement, we confess that the plan does not seem to us as Apostolic as it did. We cannot quite forget the part which that government played in some other international transactions not long since.

ENGLISH CHURCH, AND DISSENT.

American Non-Episcopal religious newspapers so often predict the speedy downfall of the English Church, that we quote as worthy of attention, the following testimony of Dissenters themselves. It may be added, that the large cities and manufacturing towns are the strongholds of dissenting influence.

The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, an able dissenting paper, says: "The dullest individual who walks the streets may note it, that all the external characteristics of a London Sunday, in so far as Divine worship is concerned, is in favor of the predominance of the Establishment. In all the suburban districts, not even excepting Hackney, noted of all as the peculiar habitat of Dissenters,—in Brixton, or Clapham, or Newington, or Highbury, or Islington, where merchants, stock brokers, and tradesmen now reside—new churches start up almost daily, and these are almost invariably crowded. I simply state this as a fact. I cannot shut my eyes to the palpable evidence which every Sunday affords, that, with the middle and upper classes, the Church is more popular, or at least more affected, than Dissenting chapels. More than once I have made it my business to note the congregations of people pouring out of churches and chapels, that I might try to ascertain, as far as externals go, the character of the classes who attend them; and I repeat, though the assertion may wound the self-love of sincere and ardent Dissenters, that the evidence afforded by a London Sunday is decidedly in favor of the predominance of the Church amongst the middle and upper classes of the metropolis. From St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey—from the aristocratic parish church of St. James' to the plainest suburban chapel of Ease—there is palpable demonstration in favor of this conclusion; and though Surrey Chapel, where Rowland Hill once held forth, usually contains its three thousand auditors, and though crowded congregations may attend the ministrations of a Binney, a Cumming, a Leifchild, a Burnett, or others of the able men who adorn the Dissenting body, it is not possible to impugn the fact that the Church more than keeps its place, if we take mere numeration and appearance as our guide."

A London paper states that the Bishop of Hereford has ordained *five* Dissenting achers to the ministry of the Church; the Bishop of Chester has ordained *two*, o came over with their congregations; and the Bishop of Lichfield from the amencement received nearly *sixty* applications from Dissenting or Wesleyan achers, to be ordained Ministers of the Church of England. The opposition to Church from Dissenters and Romanists, can easily enough be accounted for.

DISSENTING ACTIVITY *versus* CHURCH APATHY.

A correspondent of a London paper thus writes, and most truthfully, upon this bject. We beg our friends who think we are sometimes unnecessarily severe, to id the following. The Clergy, at least, have partially opened their eyes to the nger of their position.

"I wish, in other matters as well as this, some means could be found of rousing e Clergy from the political apathy which is slowly, but surely, surrendering the tablishment to its assailants. They might, if they chose, be one of the most werful, and therefore securest bodies in the country. They are highly educated, constant intercommunication, possessed of that house-to-house knowledge of the pulation, which is the essence of political influence, and include the whole of the untry within the area of their operations. No House of Commons would dare to sail them, if they used their power as any other imperilled interest would use it. ut, instead of that, in a day when the noisiest is the strongest, they stand silently r, while their defenders are beaten back from point to point from sheer want of ternal expressions of support. The Irish Bishoprics are gone—the Church revnues are gathered up, ready for spoliation, by the Ecclesiastical Commission—the mada Reserves are gone—the first outworks of Oxford have been taken—the urch-rates are all but lost—Mr. Heywood has got his fangs fixed in the Act of niformity—and Dissenters, both in England and Ireland, do not scruple to avow eir expectation of an early division of Church plunder. But the Clergy only ne at the work of destruction as it goes on, in indolent dismay; some of the most ctive of them, perhaps, railing at the House of Commons for yielding to pressure. hey might just as well rail at the barometer for pointing to rain. It is their busiess to exert pressure, and then the House of Commons will yield to them.

Take a single case, that of church-rates. Churchmen are all divided enough, it is rue, on the best mode of settling this question; but I think we are all agreed that he total abolition of the rate would be the worst. The Dissenters have been vicorious in the Commons simply by their own untiring agitation, and the Church's pathy. They loaded the table with petitions. I doubt, speaking from memory, if Churchmen sent up 500 signatures. In every constituency where they had influence, the Dissenters have strained every nerve to make it a main question in the canvass and on the hustings. I never heard of its being put forward on behalf of the Church at all. Considering how many mere waiters upon Providence there are in the House of Commons, the result might have been foreseen. Even now, if the Clergy would but learn activity from their foes, they might throw out the measure, as a year or two must elapse before it can be forced through the House of Lords. But it is an idle hope that they will really fight for this or any other point. They will not learn—no experience seems to teach them—that under free institutions 'quietness and confidence' are suicide—that those who wish to exist, politically, must not, when assailed, disdain to agitate.

WANT OF CHURCH ACCOMMODATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

A writer in the (London) *Clerical Journal* gives the following statistics. The great increase of the population in this kingdom has caused an increase of the ministry in the Established Church, and a fearful deficiency of Church accommodation. To prove this assertion, it may be necessary to lay before your readers a brief statement, though perhaps not quite accurate, as to the number of churches, chapels and curates, as published in 1856. In that year we find there are, in England and Wales, at the lowest calculation, 17,200; of these, there are at the least 1878, ranging in their endowment from 5*l.* to 100*l.* per annum inclusive; there are also rather more than 3000 with an endowment varying from 100*l.* to 180*l.* per annum inclusive, thus leaving 12,800 Churches with an endowment of from 180*l.* to 1500l. per annum: some few livings there are, I am told, producing an annual income each of a much higher sum. I have before stated, the property of the Church has increased as the land has increased in value. According to a document now before me, there were, in 1856, employed curates 4453; many of these are supported by different societies. If from the 17,200 livings we deduct the above named 4,908 livings, we have 12,292 livings, and if from this number we deduct the 4,453 employed curates, it leaves us 7,839 livings without curates. The majority of these livings have each a population under 1000.

The population of England and Wales may be estimated at 22,000,000; if we allow for Dissenters, of every denomination, 6,000,000, we have 16,000,000, either members of the Established Church or professors of no religion—or in other words infidels. Hoping the number of these is small, and that they are objects of Christian regard, we must include them in the 16,000,000. Now this number divided by the 17,200 Churches will give to each Church a congregation of 930. It may be found that a very great majority of parish Churches will not accommodate 500; but we will make this the average, and we have 7,400,000 of our people destitute of Church accommodation. Supposing 6,000,000 the maximum, and each new Church to accommodate 800 people, then 7500 Churches will be adequate to the present demand; or, if 1000 to each Church, then 6000 will be amply sufficient to meet the present deficiency; and in either case just so many ministers must be added for the services of the Church.

ERRATUM AND EDITORIAL NOTE.

In the Notice of the "Comedies of Terence" in the April Review for 1859, erase the word "Greek" in the first line of said Notice, and the exact meaning of the writer will be expressed.

A late assailant of the Review seems to have carefully treasured up this old typographical error for his own personal gratification. He is quite welcome to it. With an accurate scholar in the Ancient and Modern languages for our proof-reader, errors of the press, with all our care, will occasionally creep in. As to the points of criticism made by our new censor, they seem, in every case, to have been the result of his own ignorance or misconception. He certainly does not seem to know that the Comedies of Terence were not only founded upon the Greek model, but that they were actually translated, either wholly or in part, from the Greek Comedies themselves.

It is one of our standing rules to avoid personalities ourselves, and to ignore them on the part of others. But we are not to be turned aside, by them, from the freest and boldest vindication of the cardinal doctrines of the Faith and the Church of CHRIST.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XIII. OCTOBER, 1860. No. 3.

ART. I.—THE PRESENT STATE AND PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.—No. III.

(CONCLUDED.)

THE FORTUNES OF THE HEBREW NATION AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE Hebrew People were elected from among the nations of the earth for a particular purpose, that among them and of their blood, the SON OF GOD, THE ETERNAL WORD should be incarnate and be born a man, that so in that nation the evil of the Fall should be repaired and the Messiah, the Christ, the Saviour and the Redeemer of the Human Race, should restore all that had been lost in Adam. Now for this purpose they were elected, nay, for this purpose they were brought into national existence as a people, the small family of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob gradually swelling into a nation and a race in Egypt. For this peculiar end they were, as a nation, organized and consecrated by God Himself. Examine their national polity, their religious institutions, their rites and ceremonies; their perennial current of prophecy flowing on close by the national life as a stream from the Eden that man had lost, and

the centre of all this rich and manifold national life is that one figure, the Messiah, the coming Saviour of the Human Race!

Nay, so full is all their history of this idea, that now that it has past by, the typical meaning seems almost to predominate over the actual and real events, the type over the facts. Behold Israel a slave in the dark Egypt unto Pharoah its King. Egypt is, to the Christian, forever a type of the fallen condition of man, and Pharoah of Satan, the ruler of the darkness of this world. Moses stands forever in the language of Holy Writ for the Law which convinces man of sin; Canaan for the heavenly land; Joshua for our Saviour, Jesus Christ, who brings thereunto; Jordan for the flood of death which must be passed through by all. All circumstances, all localities, all facts, which came in contact with the national mind of the Israelitish nation were steeped and soaked and saturated with that one idea. All paths led to it; from all points of his national life, the Jew saw it placed centrally before him.

And, in order that in the appointed time this event, so glorious for the nation, such a blessing to the whole human race, should take place, there was a land chosen for them, "a good land, flowing with milk and honey." And in this land were given to them, living as they did in the childhood of the world, in the grey dawn and dim twilight of history, privileges, religious and political, the contemplation of which, even in this age, advanced as it is in all knowledge, is enough to awaken the utmost admiration and amazement. To them the knowledge of the sanctions of the Moral Law came no longer by dim and fading tradition. The Personality of God was distinctly revealed to them, and His Unity. And His Law for them was writen in a book.* It was embodied also in a liturgic and ritual, and political system, wherein all the relations of God to man, all the manifold facts and truths, and duties

* The importance of a written revelation, in precision, clearness, distinctness, we do not, for want of thought, fully understand, or how far it is exalted above mere oral tradition. Wolfe tells us, somewhere, that the Mohammedans of Hindustan see this difference very clearly. They call the Jews, the Christians, and themselves, "People of the Book."

that arise from the existence of God, and of man, are brought out with giant grandeur of mass and bulk, and at the same time with the distinct and delicate outline of an ivory carving. And this, five hundred years and more before Homer, that is to say, before history in any shape got into existence! Then and there this race had a written law, so grand and sublime, so clear and distinct, so humane and tender, so legal and ethical, that to us, this day, in the nineteeth century after Christ, it is part of our sacred book,—our Bible. And this, when the whole world was plunged in idolatry, heathenism, gross ignorance and the utmost corruption and depravity! This is a miracle and a wonder, whose magnitude we cannot measure because of our Christian familiarity with the Pentateuch, and with the ideas of God's being and attributes therein contained. But no greater miracle would it have been, if in the land of Israel daylight and darkness had existed, alternately, and in the order of nature, and meanwhile over the rest of the world material darkness had perpetually spread and brooded. One would have been no greater miracle than the other was in fact and truth.

But when we come to their political constitution as a nation, and consider it in reference to its two ends—the first, the coming of the Messiah, and the second, the social well-being of the nation, and of all men in it, the provision that is made for the life, liberty and happiness of the individual man, we are struck dumb with astonishment. It seems as if all the political wisdom which we have seen develop itself slowly and laboriously through the tedious course of European History, each particular device of the statesmen, each privilege of the subject or citizen of any European nation were there placed at once, and together, as parts of a well-working State machinery of polity and law. Nay, take the political speculators from Plato downward, the enthusiastic philanthropists down to our present era, and it does seem that measures which, unto them, were benevolent imaginations, far-away philanthropic dreams, were in this legislation realized as facts. In truth and in fact, the constitutional liberty which we and England boast of as peculiar to ourselves above all natoins of

the Nineteenth Century, the Jewish people possessed more than three thousand years ago.

This National Constitution, in a political and legal point of view, is such a miracle of sagacity, that to quote the words of a writer in the Church Review,

"It is said by those, whose researches have been far more extensive than ours, that there is not, and never has been a criminal code making any considerable pretensions to completeness, and to be based upon general principles, except that given in the Pentateuch, and those in modern times which profess to be based upon the Mosaic. At all events, the criminal code of both the civil and the common law are properly based upon the Mosaic code.

"Nor was this merely a code of criminal laws. It provided for most, if not quite, all those civil relations of man towards his fellow, to which the restrictions of the Jewish polity intended to allow an existence. Nor have all the advances which modern times have been able to make in the science of legislation and political economy, in the knowledge of the rights of man and the capacity for self-government, been able to make any considerable improvement upon this ancient code."*

It is not our business to discuss the spirit of the Mosaic Law, though such a discussion, wrought out and completed as it ought to be in our land, by a man of political ability and Christian faith, superadded to learning and judiciousness, will be the greatest gift that can be given to the American Church and Nation. We say this, perforce, for it is our experience that babyish credulity, rationalistic and skeptical learning, and flippant self-conceit, in a word every thing un-historic and unphilosophic, everything devoid of legislative science and political knowledge and sagacity, seems to have been the staple of those talents which, in modern times, have been employed in elucidating the Laws of Moses.

We will specify a few of these political privileges we have spoken of. That great fact, upon which we lay so much stress, upon which, as a nation, we so much pride ourselves, that we possess a written Constitution, they had, as also written laws.

And of this their Constitution seems as if the very fundamental idea of the American Declaration, "that all men are born free and equal," were the prevailing and central idea as far as regards the condition of the citizens. The Englishman Horne,

* Church Review, 1858, p. 200–1.

Introduction, is so much struck with this fact, that he
es that "the form of the Hebrew Republic was, unques-
ly, Democratical"*—which, in a certain limited sense, is
ut not by any means, we think, in the sense in which Mr.
understands it. More than this, it does seem, when we
e the thing clearly, that each Tribe of Israel had the
al position our States have, so far as being Sovereign
, mutually allied—with each of them the power of life
ath, and of an executive and a judicial body of its own.
t this, our famous new political invention of a Federated
lic of Sovereign States, belongs to Moses, the Lawgiver
el!

in, it seems that the Lawgiver, as the means we suppose
king the greatest number of people happy, aimed at an
ty, not only "before the Law," but also an equality of
and circumstances. The Golden Mean of the poets
hilosophers, which never has existed since his common-
, he secured to his people. There was no king, in any
an or Shemitic sense, existing in the Commonwealth of

There was no constitutional class of hereditary nobles.
ople were all equal; the Law divine and political, and
ir official capacity as interpreters of it, Moses and
—the Priesthood and the Magistracy—were supreme.
hen the priest and the magistrate descended from their
height, they seem to have been on a level in all things
he poorest Israelite. They had, thereafter, no predomi-
of rank. Their only superiority was of good deeds done,
igh character for the past. Horne may call this "Dem-
:" certainly it is not Feudal or European; assuredly, it
just and righteous.

if, by the exclusion of Monarchy and of Nobility, the
as sought to be made supreme over all monopoly, all
tary privilege, as is the case in our own Constitution, a
equality was secured, both in real estate and also in per-
property. The head of every family was a landholder. His
ty was inalienable. It could never pass into any other

* Horne's Introduction, Philadelphia edition; vol. ii. p. 41.

hands than those of that family. Here we have, at once, an equality established over the whole nation, of a small sufficient landed property. This is the modern principle of "Land-limitation," which has been agitated with such fervor in this country during the twenty past years. It embraces, too, the principle of the "Homestead Act," which so many American States have enacted, and, also, the English principle of landed Entail. Only this Hebrew Entail prevents an Aristocracy, secures an equality of condition, and protects the nation against pauperism. The other, the English Entail, engrosses the land into huge bodies, and is thereby the foundation of a Nobility. It also turns the body of the nation into day laborers—men without land, and therefore without education, without independence, and without political power.

But as a further move in the same direction, foreign commerce is discountenanced by the Law of Moses, and, also, the taking of interest upon money from a fellow-citizen is wholly forbidden. Thus the accumulation of wealth in the way of money, and, therefore, the existence of a moneyed aristocracy, is wholly prevented. An equality of circumstances in this way also is secured. Here is a strange contrast: the Israelite in the palmy days of his Commonwealth was a contented husbandman, with little or no trade, no banking, no usury. We may add, also, that before the days of Saul he was no wanderer over the face of the earth, but a steady "dweller among his own people," whose great desire was "to be buried with his fathers in their sepulchre." It is only since the nation has rejected God, that the Israelite has become a Jew. The whole world over, there is no fact more notorious than the aversion of the whole race, at this day, to all the pursuits of agriculture.

One thing draws on another. The absence of a Nobility and a King, as well as the provisions last mentioned, secured the State against the great curse of modern Europe, Pauperism: Nobles at the top, using for ostentation, for vanity or for vice, the wealth that might have fed millions; pauperism at the bottom—the idle, the vicious, the unfortunate, the diseased, the unable of the landless class—this seems to be the

natural order of every European State. The only check to the spread of both classes, that we have heard of in History being, f no emigration be open before them, war, or famine, or pestilence. By God's Providence Israel of old had no aristocracy, either have we.

And here we utter one thought that has long dwelt upon ur minds. When our land is all sold out and in private ands, then at once, by the natural increase of population, a aboring class which owns no land begins to appear. This nders "Rent," in the sense of the Politcal Economists of urope, a possible thing. Land becomes then what it is not ow—a good investment for money. Thus originates gradu-lly a Landed Aristocracy. The appearance at the two ex-remes of society of a laboring landless class, and of a class wning land and living on its annual proceeds without labor, s the first sign of danger to the continuance of the Republic. f these two classes get fully and distinctly into recognized egal existence, it cannot then last very long.

As an addition to the constitutional impediments to Nobility nd Pauperism established in the law of Moses, we would add, s the most in contrast with all heathen nationality, the lovely pirit of the Mosaic legislation, so full of pity and mercy owards the poor, that it alone is enough to indicate the hea-enly origin of that Polity.*

We have but one thing more. Their constitution secured hem also from one of the worst political evils of modern imes—a Standing Army. In Europe, at the present time, the

* "If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy ates in thy land which the LORD thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thine eart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother; But thou shalt open thine hand ide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need, *in that* which he anteth. Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying, The sev-nth year, the year of release, is at hand; and thine eye be evil against thy oor brother, and thou givest him nought; and he cry unto the LORD against thee, nd it be sin unto thee. Thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart shall not be rieved when thou givest unto him: because that for this thing the LORD thy God hall bless thee in all thy works, and in all that thou puttest thine hand unto. For he poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou halt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in the and."—*Deut.* xv., 7–12.

standing armies of the various powers amount to four millions of men! This is the devouring plague of Europe at the present time, the swarm of locusts that eat up every green thing upon the earth. It upholds despotism, it corrupts morals, it feeds upon the industry and the commerce of the nation, producing itself nothing in return. Even the Romans made their soldiers, laborers, artizans, the constructors of mighty systems of roads and other internal improvements; but the standing armies of modern Europe live in systematic and enforced idleness; they have a haughty scorn of all labor; they are the curse and plague and ruin of every European State, morally, politically, and financially. And yet we suppose the state of Europe at present renders them unavoidably necessary. This evil the People of Israel were secured against by the framework of their national being.

In addition to this absence of a standing army, we see another constitutional provision which looks at first sight very strange,—the prohibition to the Israelites against cavalry,—against "going into Egypt for horses." This, of course, with the other constitutional provisions, had the immediate effect of securing the nation against military ambition abroad, the lust of Foreign Conquest. And yet, when we look farther through Asiatic history, it has a deeper significance. The horse is perhaps the noblest animal of those few that can dwell with man in all climates; and yet, in the strife between barbarism and civilization, what a fate has his become! Everywhere, in war, from the earliest time, the horse has been the ally of barbarism. The foot-soldier alone in ancient history, is on the side of civilization. See the early Greek civilization of Asia Minor overpowered by the mighty Lydian horsemen of the Mermnadae. See the Persian, the Saracen, the Turcoman, the Koord, the Mongol, the Mahratta, the Pindarree, everywhere throughout all time, from Gyges downward, the instrument whereby savagery has sustained itself among the Semitic races, is the horse. In and over all the Asiatic regions, its presence even now is the main stay of barbarism; wherever it is kept out, there an approach to civilization at once begins. No wonder then, that the horse was prohibited to the Israelites.

Here then we have the children of Israel under this peculiar constitution, dwelling in their chosen land four hundred years. We hear of no foreign wars or conquests. When they fell away from God, then he brought upon them invaders who ravaged the land, Jabin, or the host of Midian, or the Philistines, or the King of the children of Ammon. When they repented and turned unto God, then he raised up heroes, their so-called Judges,* who led them against their enemies and delivered them—Barak and Gideon, Jepthah and Samson and Samuel. These wars, purely punitive on the part of God, purely defensive in the national point of view, seem to have been their only wars. They were a peaceful nation, abounding in everything that could make life happy, raised up and maintained in national well-being by the hand of God for a particular purpose. Now let us reflect upon all these things. The provisions they embrace are manifestly the perfection of wisdom, if the well being of the nation and of all individuals within it is to be the main object of government. It manifestly is no Utopia of a political dreamer, no New Atlantis. This constitution was once really in action; this body of laws were the real laws of a nation living upon the earth. And at the same time we grant that their existence is something wonderful—nay, miraculous. We say more than this; we say that the existence of the Hebrew Commonwealth under these laws and this constitution, is a perfect miracle, the greatest of all the miracles of the Old Testament. And here we come in view of the great central fact of the whole national existence

* We are very apt to be led away by words. This word "Judge" leads men generally to the notion of a high judicial officer, such as our Chief Justice, and of a regular succession of them; whereas the fact is that the word "Hero" would come nearer the truth. "Shaphat," the verb from which "Shophetim" comes, has certainly the sense "to Judge," but just as certainly to "rule as a king," and "to vindicate." The "Shophet" was a heroic man, who, when Israel repented of the sins for which the nation was scourged by foreign invasion, was raised up by the peculiar providence of God to "rule" the people in their conflict with the invaders, and "revenge" them upon their enemies. Such were all called "Judges," from Joshua to Samuel. The "Judge" in this sense, and the "Prophet," were extraordinary officers, raised up for particular times, and such as belonged to no other nation than Israel. Only to a people under the immediate superintendance of Jehovah were such officers possible.

and constitution—the "Theocracy." And what is this? Words and the use of words spoil our ideas. This word in reference to the Jewish People, implies that they had no king but God; it implies that God was their King; it implies that He was the King of the people of Israel in a predominant sense, more than He is the King of the whole world. It asserts that in the Tabernacle He was actually and really present to the nation, ruling, guiding, controlling, capable of being consulted and giving counsel, performing as a present King and God to the nation of Israel all the offices which a King performs to his people.*

Now let us take this idea in and dwell upon it, and completely comprehend and realize it, and it is an idea of most miraculous grandeur. That a race of human beings existing in history should for nearly four hundred years live in their land under the Rule of God the Word abiding among them, King in presence, in power, in control, this is an idea so far uplifted above the ordinary current of the thoughts of men, that even when they use the words expressing it, they hardly even dream of the reality those words convey. And yet the whole narration clearly conveys this idea and none else. Less than this in truth is not adequate to its meaning. The Theocracy of Israel was an actual monarchy of God the Word over the chosen people, the seed of Abraham, in the Holy Land!

Now this most extraordinary prerogative alone renders possible the existence of such an extraordinary constitution. Church and State in modern times has always taken the Jewish commonwealth as its main argument.† It has always forgotten this grand fact. Give us again that privilege that God the Word ever present should be the *bona fide* King of any

* It was strictly and exclusively a Theocracy, Christ being present with his Church in the promised land as truly and really as he was in the wilderness."—*Dr. Jarvis' Church of the Redeemed*, p. 109.

† It is a very noticeable fact, that when Israel passed away by her own act from the government of their King Jehovah to that of Saul, one of the most conspicuous acts of the king is his massacre of the Priests of the Lord. "And the king said to the footmen, Turn and slay the priests of the LORD; and they would not. And

n, and in that nation, as in the Jewish, the Church must
ited with the State. In the absence of that miraculous
ege, their utter separation, the perfect freedom of the
ch, is the best. This argument is the first of all Impe-
t and Papalist fallacies and fooleries.

e need only allude to these other Theocratic schemes. The
n Catholic notion of the Pope being Lord of the whole
, having the two swords, the Jesuit attempt at organiz-
Theocracy in Paraguay, the so-called Puritan Theocracy
w England,—all these notions are not "Theocracy," the
nment of God, but they are the rule and civil government
ngy, Papal, Jesuit, or Puritan, under pretence of God.
less need we speak of the Anabaptist fanatics of Germany,
ifth Monarchy men of England, bringing in the "reign of
Jesus" with pike and gun,—all these were misapplica-
of the word, all delusive imaginations that a peculiar
could be restored to the world without the one only con-
n that renders that state possible.

re then we have the Jewish nation with a purpose to ful-
r which they had been chosen and elect of God,—with all
eans to fulfil it,—under a constitution the most extraordi-
and the most full of blessings that ever has been upon
arth,—with that great question which to all nations, hea-
and Christian, has been the most full of debate and
—the relation of Religion to the State—settled for them
organized priesthood and magistracy whose present King
Head was Jehovah,—with all memorials before their eyes
heir minds to keep this purpose in remembrance,—with all
s in their hands to fulfil it,—nay, with their national well-
of the most perfect kind for the present,—and national
ises before them of the loftiest that have ever been before
ion. In despite of all these they deserted and abandoned
constitution and God their King, against the clearly ex-
ed will of God, against the declaration by the mouth of
prophet Samuel, nay, against the immediate evidence of

---

ag said to Doeg, Turn thou and fall upon the priests. And Doeg the Edom-
ned, and he fell upon the priests and slew on that day fourscore and five per-
hat wore a linen Ephod."—1 *Sam.*, xxii., 17 and 18.

a miracle. There are three passages that give the historical account of this transaction; these the importanceof the subject will authorize us in quoting in full, (1 Samuel, chap. viii.)

"And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, that he made his sons judges over Israel. Now the name of his first-born was Joel, and the name of his second, Abiah: *they were* judges in Beer-sheba. And his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment. Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD. And the LORD said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done, since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods; so do they also unto thee. Now, therefore, hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them. And Samuel told all the words of the LORD unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you; He will take your sons, and appoint *them* for himself, for his chariots, and *to be* his horsemen; and *some* shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and *will set them* to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters *to be* confectionaries, and *to be* cooks, and *to be* bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, *even* the best *of them*, and give *them* to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put *them* to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day, because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not hear you in that day. Nevertheless, the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel: and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles. And Samuel heard all the words of the people, and he rehearsed them in the ears of the LORD. And the LORD said to Samuel, Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city."

The second time the subject was brought before them (1 Samuel, x., 17–25), reads,

"And Samuel called the people together unto the LORD to Mizpeh, And said unto the children of Israel, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hands of all kingdoms, *and* of them that oppressed you: And ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and

ur tribulations; and ye have said unto him, *Nay*, but set a king over us. Now refore, present yourselves before the LORD by your tribes, and by your thou-nds. And when Samuel had caused all the tribes of Israel to come near, the be of Benjamin was taken. When he had caused the tribe of Benjamin to come r by their families, the family of Matri was taken, and Saul, the son of Kish, s taken: and when they sought him, he could not be found. Therefore they uired of the LORD further, if the man should yet come thither. And the RD answered, Behold, he hath hid himself among the stuff. And they ran and shed him thence: and when he stood among the people, he was higher than any the people, from his shoulders and upward.. And Samuel said to all the peo-, See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen, that *there is* none like him among all people? And all the people shouted, and said, God save the king! Then muel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote *it* in a book, and d *it* up before the LORD. And Samuel sent all the people away, every man to house."

And the third, (1 Samuel, xii.)

"And Samuel said unto all Israel, Behold, I have hearkened unto your voice in that ye said unto me, and have made a king over you. And now, behold, the ng walketh before you: and I am old and gray-headed; and, behold, my sons *are* th you; and I have walked before you from my childhood unto this day. Be-ld, here I am: witness against me before the LORD, and before his anointed; ose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? om have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received *any* bribe to blind ne eyes therewith? and I will restore it you. And they said, Thou hast not de-nded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken aught of any man's hand. nd he said unto them, The LORD *is* witness against you, and his anointed *is* tness this day, that ye have not found aught in my hand. And they answered, *is* witness. And Samuel said unto the people, *it is* the LORD that advanced ses and Aaron, and that brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt. Now refore stand still, that I may reason with you before the LORD of all the right-us acts of the LORD, which he did to you and to your fathers. When Jacob was ne into Egypt, and your fathers cried unto the LORD, then the LORD sent Moses d Aaron, which brought forth your fathers out of the land of Egypt, and made em dwell in this place. And when they forgat the LORD their God, he sold them to the hand of Sisera, captain of the host of Hazor, and into the hand of the hilistines, and into the hand of the king of Moab; and they fought against them. nd they cried unto the LORD, and said, We have sinned, because we have for-ken the LORD, and have served Baalim and Ashtaroth: but now deliver us out the hand of our enemies, and we will serve thee. And the LORD sent Jerubbaal, d Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and delivered you out of the hand of your emies on every side, and ye dwelled safe. And when ye saw that Nahash, the ng of the children of Ammon, came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a ng shall reign over us; when the LORD your GOD *was* your king. Now therefore hold the king whom ye have chosen, *and* whom ye have desired! and, behold, e LORD hath set a king over you. If ye will fear the LORD, and serve him, and bey his voice, and not rebel against the commandment of the LORD, then shall

both ye, and also the king that reigneth over you, continue following the LORD your God: But if ye will not obey the voice of the LORD, but rebel against the commandment of the LORD, then shall the hand of the LORD be against you, as it *was* against your fathers. Now therefore stand and see this great thing, which the LORD will do before your eyes. *Is it* not wheat harvest to-day? I will call unto the LORD, and he shall send thunder and rain, that ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the LORD, in asking you a king. So Samuel called unto the LORD; and the LORD sent thunder and rain that day; and all the people greatly feared the LORD and Samuel. And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the LORD thy God, that we die not: for we have added unto all our sins *this* evil, to ask us a king. And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not: (ye have done all this wickedness; yet turn not aside from following the LORD, but serve the LORD with all your heart; And turn ye not aside: for *then should ye go* after vain *things*, which cannot profit nor deliver; for they *are* vain:) For the LORD will not forsake his people, for his great name's sake; because it hath pleased the LORD to make you his people. Moreover, as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the LORD in ceasing to pray for you: but I will teach you the good and the right way: Only fear the LORD, and serve him in truth with all your heart: for consider how great *things* he hath done for you. But if ye still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king."

It seems, therefore, that three times, upon three distinct occasions, the nation rejected Jehovah for their king. And this is the more distinctly seen in its heinousness and wilfulness, when we look back to the nineteenth chapter of Exodus, and see therein, that the giving of the law upon Mount Sinai, and the whole organization of the Jewish Commonwealth was preceded by a formal and solemn proposal on the part of God, that He should be the King of Israel, and they become His people, and that there was an equally solemn acceptation of this proposal on the side of the people, by their Elders: (Exodus, chap. xix, to 8th verse.*)

---

* "In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come to the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness; and there Israel had camped before the mount. And Moses went up unto God, and the LORD called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and *how* I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came, and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their

The first remark we shall make upon this rejection of Je-ah for their King, is to give our readers to understand what Israelites desired in his stead. We know, in history, but e three forms of Royalty. The first is the Patriarchal g, the Father of his people, governing by the grace of God, h the true feeling of a father towards his people, loved in rn with a true filial loyalty. Where this class of kings gone to in these latter days it would be hard to say. Stand-armies, foreign wars, military genius, high taxation, na-al debts, centralization, and governments by bureau, seem ave pretty well worn out this ancient theory and idea of archy in Europe. Secondly, comes the idea of the Consti-ional King, the lifelong and hereditary chief magistrate of a people. An idea which, we conceive, is owing partly to traditional influence of the Roman nation, and partly to istianity. And thirdly, we see "the King like the nations" ch the children of Israel desired. They were "Hagnam" he People of God," that is; all the rest of the world then e Haggoyim, "the nations of Heathenism." Give us a g *like the heathen*, "That he may go before us and fight our tles." This is the kind of king—"the war king of the then"—the king that they chose instead of Jehovah. arod was the first of that class—the mighty hunter of ; a military monarch whose life was war: his object uni-al conquest and empire. Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnez-; Darius the Mede, and Cyrus the Persian; Sheshonk Egyptian; Tirhakah the Ethiopian: all were of this class. t Layard, in his Nineveh, has opened up to our knowledge ultitude of Ninevite and Assyrian kings of this sort: the s of monarchs who live in war and desire universal dominion. is, as a class, essentially anti-Christian.* From the As-

---

all these words which the LORD commanded him. And all the people an-ed together, and said, All that the LORD hath spoken we will do. And s returned the words of the people unto the LORD."

Faber, (G. S.) with that vivid genius and wide research which he possessed bundantly, collected a mass of notes of this kind connected with the French olution and its leaders. But, with the unthinking and rapid power of generali-on, and the crudeness of judgment which makes his works such a hodge-

syrian kings who made themselves be worshipped as "God by their people, (Nimrod, the king, was, also, Baal or Belus, their God;) down to Buonaparte: in them all plain marks of Antichrist are to be seen. This was the sort of king the Israelites chose instead of Jehovah. They made this choice, in their own proud self-will, and annulled, as far as regarded their nation, the will of God. Their prosperity was arrested in mid-career. They were to have been as the stars of heaven in multitude. They seem about that time to have reached, as an ingenious writer in Blackwood calculates, about six millions of people; and to be about the same at the present time: never, in all the intervening ages, to have passed that number. The growth of the nation was arrested.

"In them all the nations of the earth were to have been blessed." It seems, if we may judge of the course of this world's Civilization since then, that they were God's inheritance, fenced in from among the circumjacent nations, who were sunk in all foul pollution. They were a people that he had secluded for himself, under his own monarchy, his own teaching, in order that in his good time they might be in the civilization of the whole world a glory to themselves, a beacon and a light to forlorn humanity. They rejected the royalty of Jehovah in their own pride and self-will, and chose them a king "like the heathen," and so they made vain the purpose of God towards themselves, and as regards their national glory and well being, they made void his will. The race that was expanding towards the number of the stars of heaven, became cramped and confined. And to the national religion, and national morality, and the national sense of law and equity of Republican Rome, and to the poetic and philosophic, the political and historic genius of Hellas was given to do that work upon the world, of civilization, feebly and imperfectly, which Israel, had she been

podge, he made use of them to build up a kind of Babel theory of the fulfillment of prophecy. Yet the indications are there in existence distinctly. In fact, as we have shown in a former note in these papers, Antichristianism is twofold, spiritual and temporal. The very idea of an Universal Monarchy on the part of man is an attempted usurpation of the prerogative of God; and, therefore, whoever conceives or attempts to carry out such a scheme, in him will Antichristian marks appear. From Nimrod to Buonaparte, the same result appears.

nationally faithful to her God and King, might, with national glory and national blessing to herself, have done.

Their wish was granted: for, as we have said, nations have "free will" as well as men. Almost the first consequence of it was a breach and dissolution of the Union of Israel—the greatest curse and affliction that can happen to a nation, whose country is one, their blood one, their language one, and their interests the same. With Israel it became, as it always must be in such a case, the established constitutionality of a chronic state of civil war.

And so they went on to the end. Of the long train of the kings of Judah and Israel, we can hardly count ten good. Even their wise Solomon brake all the laws of God, ground down the nation with taxes, accumulated wives and concubines, sent to Egypt for horses, and worshipped idols, the idols of the heathen—Ashtoreth and Chemosh, Milcom and Moloch—that is, the foulest and filthiest, the cruellest and most brutal gods of the heathen, with the details of whose rites we dare not pollute our pages. In short, the greatest of their kings, so far as the being established peacefully in the monarchy at the era of the highest prosperity of Israel, did everything to contravene the warnings God had given Israel, in case the people should reject Him for their King and take a king like the nations.* Onward, from his reign, one after another of their kings dragged down the nation to the abyss of ruin, until finally, owing to their national corruption, their idolatry and licentiousness, they were given up into the hand of the Assyrians,—Israel first, and then Judah.

And Judah then was brought back to run through a course nearly the same, until we find the Jews, at our Saviour's time,

* This refers to a prevision of the sin of Israel in rejecting Jehovah, after so long a period of time had elapsed: and a constitutional and fundamental law, prescribed for them in case they should abase themselves from the lofty station of God's peculiar people, ruled by the present majesty of God the Word, their King, and choose them "a king like the heathen." The whole passage is to be seen in Deuteronomy, (chap. xvii. 14, to the end.) In it occurs these words: "He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses, for as much as the Lord hath said unto you, ye shall return no man that way, neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away, neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold."

under the monarchy of Herod, a king worthy of the people over whom he reigned. A nation, whose king was Herod, whose leaders of national feeling were the Pharisees, whose philosophers were the Sadducees, whose patriots in the lower orders of the people, were the Zealots, the Sicarii, Judas of Galilee, and Barabbas. Well might the lordly Roman in his stern, military and political strength, his Epicurean indifference, look down upon them with cool and careless scorn. "Gallio said unto the Jews, if it were a matter of wrong, or of wicked lewdness, O, ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you. But, if it be a question of words and names and of your law, look ye to it. And he drave them from the judgment seat. And the Jews took Sosthenes the chief ruler of the synagogne and beat him before the judgment seat, and Gallio cared for none of these things.*" To any one, that knows aught of the character of the later Romans and of the Jews of that period, the contemptuous indifference of Gallio, and the low bitter fanaticism of the Jews, in this narration, is an abundant historic confirmation of its actual truth. The heathen proverb is true: "Corruptio optimis fit pessima." The happiest, when fallen by sin, is the most wretched; the noblest becomes the meanest; the grandest, the most contemptible. So has it been with the historic career of the Chosen People, from the time they rejected their God, until they ceased as a nation to have a country. Their course since then we do not consider in this paper.

Now, as we said, we have no guide, in reference to the future, but the past; no rule of reason to apply to the dealings of God with men or nations, but the analogy of His former dealings. And this, applied in analogous cases, is a very sufficient reply to objections. We will then recall to our readers' minds what we stated at the beginning of this paper, that an objection may be made to our "American Catholic theory," that it supposes an injury to have been done to the Church of God, under Constantine, from which it has suffered since that time, which would seem to be inconsistent with the Constitution of the Church, as an Election to carry out the designs of God. We

* Acts, chap. xviii., v. 14.

ıt the objector back to the Hebrew Election, we show a on organized, we show a constitution and a law given, sings promised, a present king and governor, and all this ;ted, cast away, and changed by themselves. The analogy rfect, the objections are completely replied to. If, of its free will, the one Election could reject its God, deny his archy, undo the purposes of God as concerns the glory and -being of the nation, there is no great mistake in consider- hat the other Election might have done the same, no in- ruity in supposing that the Christian Church, in the time onstantine, might have put itself in such a position as to r upon it a long train of corruption and decay; so that by the providence of God, only by His infinite mercy, only he fact that the oldest region* of the world was kept for ages ı the knowledge of man, and finally a peculiar people placed e under peculiar conditions, and separated from all the poli- and all the strife, religious and civil, of the old world. And only by this, should the will and decree of God, as regards Church, be saved from the consequences of the self-will and wickedness of man. We can appeal to all who read these rs to say, whether the theory of an American Catholic rch, the Universal Church, by the providence of God, of a race in a new land, and in future the leader of a new ement, over the whole world, towards Primitive Christianity, ot the only hope of the Christian religion for the future, nity, in holiness, universal sway over the whole earth, but the theory that is most confirmed by the analogies of the , the experience and the facts of the only parallel case that ts in History.†

We have understood that Geologists assert, as one of the latest results of science, that this "New World" is really the oldest continent of all. How ge a fact, when viewed in connection with the historical development of popu- and civilization, this is.

t is to be seen that we put a great difference between the fate of Israel, the ı, in consequence of their sin, and that of the Christian Church. The nation ı Hebrews existed in the Holy Land under the monarchy of Jehovah. They ed down from that position, and accepting a king "like the heathen," they emselves upon their level, and hence were, as a nation, ruined. The Church

The further course of our inquiry will lead us to exemplify what we have already fully shown in our last article, that, to place the Christian Church in union with the State, originates, fosters, and brings to maturity all the corruptions which have tormented Europe for fourteen hundred years. And that this takes place by the natural operation of causes brought into action by that union. In order to do this, we shall in our next, bring again upon the stage, for examination in somewhat of a new light and under new principles, Constantine, "the sacred Emperor, equal to the Apostles," the first originator of the union of Church and State.

---

of God, as such, is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic: as such, it has peculiar promises in its corporate capacity. We look upon it, that God in His mercy has upheld it against its corruptions, has sustained it in its feebleness, and reserves for it a period of purity and holiness, of oneness and eventual universality, which is to be brought about by His providence in the ordinary course of events, as the last period, the completion and consummation of the world.

Art. II.—GREENE'S BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES.

iographical Studies. By George Washington Greene. ' York: G. P. Putnam. 1860, 12mo., pp. 233.

HIS is a charming book of its kind, and that a kind always ghtful to readers of just taste and true culture. Next to pleasure of studying the master works of men of genius, at of reading a genial and appreciative criticism of them; our enjoyment of both is greatly increased when we are duced to a knowledge of the men themselves—their char- s, their looks, their ways of living and talking, their ts of study and work.

r. Greene has taken for the subject of his "Studies," the great names on the roll of our country's literature and art. OOPER, Cole, Crawford and Irving. He has brought to abor of love, qualifications rarely combined. With a nat- taste for the pure and beautiful, singularly just and true delicate, and with a high and fine culture derived from and intimate familiarity with the choicest works of ancient modern literature and art, it was his good fortune to have yed the personal acquaintance of the men he writes about, icularly of Cooper, Cole, and Crawford—with whom he l in habits of intimacy and friendship.

is not our purpose to take occasion from Mr. Greene's t, to give any disquisitions of our own on the genius, char- r, and productions of the persons who form its subject; to give a particular analysis of the contents of the book. s a work to be characterized rather than analyzed. It is nguished for exquisite purity of English, elegance and pol- of style, delicacy, refinement and subtlety of thought, for appreciation of character, profound knowledge and perfect ness of judgment of the principles and processes of the tiful in art, and for a lively sensibility to all beauty in re, in art and in human character, manifesting itself in

the way of simple, natural and genuine feeling on the part of the author. How truly and exactly we express the character of the book in these words, our readers who have not read it, can fully perceive and feel only by reading it through for themselves, a pleasure we advise them to give themselves as soon as possible. Meantime we shall content ourselves with selecting here and there a few passages which may partly justify what we have said, serve the present pleasure of our readers, and send them to the larger enjoyment of the book itself.

The first piece is of COOPER—of whom Mr. Greene gives us some personal recollections, very pleasant in themselves, and very pleasantly written. We shall make no extracts here, and for the best of reasons, to wit: that we purpose at an early day to devote an Article to Mr. Cooper, in which we shall not only speak of him as a Novelist, but shall also aim at portraying, however imperfectly, one who has added so largely to the treasures of our national literature. But of Mr. Greene's treatment of Cooper, we may say, that he has found a genial subject in the character and works of one, to whom all our brightest and noblest literary celebrities have united in paying honor.

The second sketch is of COLE, of whom Mr. Greene justly remarks, "there are few lives in the history of art or literature, which afford a more beautiful illustration of the elevating influence of a noble purpose, than that of Thomas Cole." And charmingly has the author sketched the artist's career, from his early struggles to the summit of success, and to the peaceful close of his pure and beautiful life. It was in Rome that he knew Cole and learned to love him as a man, as well as to admire him as an artist; and all who knew him loved him as a man even more than they admired him as an artist. Thus he speaks of him there:

"His mind was always full, and his imagination always on the wing. It was delightful to sit by him and see him paint, for his thoughts never seemed to flow more freely, or clothe themselves in happier language, than when his brush was in his hand. It was a pleasure, too, to visit the ruins with him: for, though not a classical scholar, he had read much and carefully, and there were few whose minds those records of joys and sorrows that have passed away stirred more deeply. Never shall I forget the tremulous tones of his voice as we followed our guide

through the catacombs by the dim light of tapers, or the expression of his countenance when we emerged from those silent chambers and caught the first glimpse of the bright blue sky and the soft outline of the Alban mount sleeping sweetly in its purple veil. But the greatest pleasure of all, was to walk with him at sunset, and through the long twilight, till the stars came forth and the moon rose. Then would all the fervor and earnestness of his mind awaken, and his beautiful fancy sport with exhaustless fertility. How happily would he trace the analogies of the moral and physical world! What delicate similes would he find, in the objects that lay before us, for feelings and thoughts within, and with what an exquisite perception would he point out every change in the clouds, and on the mountain tops, and over the vast city, as the waning light slowly faded from them! It was on these occasions, too, that he loved best to talk of his art, and the pictures that he would paint if he could but follow it according to his own conception of its office." pp. 105, 106.

While Cole was at Rome he painted over again his "Voyage of Life"—which, Mr. Greene tells us, had always been one of his favorite compositions, and which we believe will always be a favorite with the lover of Cole's pictures. The following is a charming account of Thorwaldsen's coming to see it.

"When the first three pictures were finished and the fourth nearly so, Terry lent him his studio in the Orto di Napoli to exhibit them in, and he became anxious to have Thorwaldsen see them. As I had frequent opportunities of meeting him, I undertook to arrange an interview between the two artists. Thorwaldsen accepted the invitation at once, and fixed upon the next morning for his visit. Crawford, who neglected no opportunity of conversing with his great master, offered to show him the way, and I went before to see that all was ready.

The moment that he entered the room, I could see by the lighting up of his clear, blue eye, that he felt himself at home; and before Cole could do anything more than name the subject of the series, he took up the interpretation himself, and read the story off from the canvass, with a readiness that made Cole's eyes moisten with delight. When he came to the last, he paused and gazed; then returned to the first, passed slowly before them all; and, coming back to the last again, stood before it for a long while without uttering a word. It seemed to me as if he felt that he, too, had reached that silent sea, and was comparing the recollections of his own eventful career, with the story of the old man and his shattered bark. And to this day, I can never look upon that picture, without fancying that I still see Thorwaldsen standing before it, with his gray locks falling over his shoulders, like those of the hero of the picture, and his serene features composed to deep and solemn meditation. It was the old man, in Young, walking—

"Thoughtful on the silent, solemn shore
Of that vast ocean, he must sail full soon."

When, at last, he spoke, it was in the strongest terms of gratification; and often as we used to meet during those last two years of his life in Rome, he never forgot to inquire after Cole; always ending with—"Great artist, great artist." pp. 110 111

We must give the author's exquisitely appreciative estimate of Cole as an artist, and as a man:

"As an artist, Cole's endowments were of the highest order: a vigorous and fertile imagination, a rich and lively fancy, an intuitive perception of beauty in all its various manifestations, a reverential love of truth, which made the assiduous study of nature an exhaustless source of delight, a fine eye for color, a singular felicity of combination, and that power of distinct and forcible conception, which enables the great artist to produce the greatest results by simple means. Art, for him, was a shrine at which he knelt devoutly, and in singleness and purity of heart, holding it as the highest of privileges that he was permitted to consecrate himself to the service of God and his fellow-men, through one of the purest mediums of usefulness. The time has not yet come for him to take the stand which really belongs to him. Art, with us, is as yet too much a thing of transient amusement, aiming at little things, and narrowed down to suit the size of our drawing rooms and the vanity of our purse holders. But the time will come when every true lover of nature will go to Cole as one of her most favored interpreters, blessing him for the deeper insight which he has given to her beauties, the sweet thoughts which he has mingled for us with morn and noon, and his own favorite hour of sunset, and the calm of field and forest and gentle stream, which he has brought into our homes, even amid the dust and din of the city." pp. 116, 117.

"As a man, Cole was one of the gentlest, kindest, most amiable of beings; a companion whose society never fatigued, a friend who never grew weary in good offices; full of kindly sympathies and cheering words at the right time; playful with you in your mirth, rejoicing with you in your joy; tender and soothing in your sorrows, gentle and affectionate always. He had the purest mind I ever knew,—intuitively, habitually pure,—such as you would always wish to find in one so exquisitely sensitive to the beautiful, and living in constant companionship with nature. The peculiar charm of his manner lay in its simplicity and heartiness. He would meet you with a 'good morning' that quickened the blood in your veins. His laugh was one of those clear, cheerful ones that come with the freshness of a bird's song in spring. He had as quick an eye for the ludicrous as for the beautiful, and would tell a humorous story with a kind of contagious merriment that was irresistible. And yet his feelings were singularly subject to external influences, particularly the influences of the weather, which appeared to act upon him as directly as it does on a harp-string. The clouds seemed, at times, to shut out the sunlight from his soul as completely as they do from the landscape. The sight of the cold, naked earth, in winter, chilled and disheartened him, and he would long for the snow to come and hide it, till it was time for it to put on its green again.

"His earnestness was the earnestness of the heart, extending to all things. He looked upon the whole circle of his duties in the same serious light, keenly alive to all the responsibilities of citizen, husband, father, child and friend. It was this earnestness, acting upon a highly poetical temperament, which led him to form such elevated conceptions of the office of his art. He could not believe that beautiful things were spread around us so lavishly merely to give a transient pleasure, but rather as instruments of moral culture, and elements to be woven, by the skilful hand, into emblems and illustrations of holy truths.

"Religion seemed a natural growth of his mind, like a seed falling into a genial

d springing up under kindly skies. His whole nature was imbued with it. irit of devotion pervaded all his thoughts and actions. It was with a feeling otion that he looked upon the physical world and listened meekly to its gs. It was for this that he loved to wander among the mountains, and p his spirit to the solemn influences that rise from them like anthems. It this, too, that he sought out the remote valleys and found a sabbath prom- heir repose. And it was with this glow of fervent love that he studied all nomena of nature, thanking God for their beauty, and drawing freshness ngth from his gratitude." pp. 117–119.

e justness of this praise of Cole as an artist all can judge of with a sense for the beauty of art, have had opportunity idy his pictures. All our readers too can feel the beauty r. Greene's sketch of Cole's character as a man; but only who knew him can know how true the exquisite portrai- s.

awn with an equally loving hand, with equal beauty, and equal truth of critical appreciation, is the sketch of CRAW-, starting in life as an apprentice to a wood carver, then e shop of a marble cutter in Broadway, working for daily s upon tombstones and mantelpieces, and at length win- for himself a place by the side of Thorwaldsen.

st of his time, the whole of his daylight, (says Mr. Greene, speaking of the of his life passed in the service of the marble cutters,) belonged to his em- . But the evenings were his own: and how happy was he when the sunlight, slowly creeping up the wall, announced the approach of the hour s to set him free: and when, hurrying home for a hasty meal, he could s sister under his arm, and return to the studio for his evening labor of love. he hundreds that hourly passed by that humble door, in the pursuit of e or gain, some curious one had stopped to look in, he would have seen a man about five feet eleven inches high, of a slight, but vigorous frame, with ent eyes of clear blue, ample forehead, lips full, but firm, cheeks flushed a excitement that heightened the ruddy glow of health, the muscles of the ready formed to the expression of deep feeling and elevated thought, the hestnut hair sprinkled with marble dust, a modelling tool in his hand, and stand before him, a head in clay, on which the light fell imperfectly from a fastened strongly to his hat. He would have seen that there was no common ness in that face, no common skill in that hand; and oh, why, of the hun- evelling in superfluous wealth, could not one have discovered in the toiling he future author of the Orpheus, and, devoutly thanking God for the privi- ld out a brother's hand to help him in the hour of his need, over the rugged hat still divided him from the full possession of his powers!" pp. 127, 128.

his voyage to Europe, his residence there, his earnest and hard struggles, before the harmony between invention

and execution were established, and creation ceased to be a laborious and painful process; of his Orpheus and his Washington, his happy marriage, the brilliant series of artistic successes and honors that followed, his painful, heroic death—we have no room to give any extracts from Mr. Greene's interesting narrative. We subjoin a single passage from his criticism of Crawford's genius, only regretting that we have not room for the whole:

"Of all those whose names adorn the brilliant annals of art, there is not one who brought to it a juster conception of its office, a deeper sense of its responsibilities, a keener appreciation of its joys, or a more earnest devotion to its service than Thomas Crawford. Possessing a character in which impetuosity was happily blended with firmness, and the promptings of the imagination attempered by the decisions of a sound though rapid judgment, he entered, with the thoughtfulness and deliberation of a man of business, upon a profession that he loved with the ardor and enthusiasm of a poet. Looking at art as it appeared in the history of its votaries, he saw that it demanded firmness of purpose, strength of will, power of endurance, persistency of faith. Looking within himself he saw that the thought of sacrifice awakened no fear, the assurance of trials no hesitation; that obstacles aroused his courage and opposition called forth his strength. Consciously, thus, and calmly, he entered the arena with a firm step and a beaming eye, saying that friends and occasions might fail him, but will and perseverance never. The trials came, and he bore them; opposition, and he subdued it. Prosperity followed, and it dazzled him not; triumph, and it diminished not his exertions. Ever striving, ever aspiring; rising hour by hour to higher conceptions of grandeur and beauty: what was firmness in the beginning, became, in the end, an irresistible energy; and the sublimest of all his creations was that upon which he was still laboring when the chisel fell from his hand.

"The predominant faculty of his mind was imagination. He was, in the true sense of the word, a creator. He possessed, not only the power of giving to familiar objects a new significance, but impressed his thoughts upon them so naturally that they seemed to become the reflection of his own mind. Combination, feeling, sentiment, he drew from within, and they passed with the glow of conscious life from his heart to the clay or marble. Everything that entered his mind seemed to take the tone of it, and lose its original characteristics in those which he gave it. For sunshine and dew, the riches of the earth and of the air, do not enter more freely into the infinite combinations of vegetable life, than do the materials of inspiration which lie everywhere around him, into the poet's thought. Whatever he looks upon catches life from his eye. Whatever he touches glows with responsive warmth. His step calls forth fragrance from the earth: and his voice fills the air with celestial harmonies. Millions of larks have poured forth their exultant strains for millions of men; but it was for the poet only to hear them singing 'at heaven gate.' Millions have felt their hearts strangely moved by the sight of flowers growing in a graveyard: but it was not till the poet looked upon them that they became a 'light of laughing flowers,' beaming in their unconscious beauty like 'an infant's smile over the dead.'

"It was as partaking largely of this consecrating power that Crawford revered his own art, and blessed the gift of imagination. His figures are poems, h telling some beautiful story. What rich harvest thoughts cluster around 'Genius of Autumn!' What recollections of boyhood, what sweet memories of unchecked, unbidden joys,' inspired his 'Genius of Mirth!' And how truthy, too, is that other phase of childhood, the sudden pause, as if some incompreible thought had come over it, expressed in the bewildered earnestness of the ild and Butterfly!' The Orpheus is a beautiful mythological poem, an almost unscious response to the influences under which he had passed his first years in me. His love of music has wrought itself in his portrait statue of Beethoven a form as grand as the grandest symphonies of the mighty German. And his shington: what a conception of moral sublimity and intellectual power! And t a glowing, exultant, almost defiant patriotism in his 'Genius of America,' ing her right hand upon her sword, her left upon her emblazoned shield, with broad-winged eagle cowering upon her crest, and looking forth, in the pride of beauty and her strength, from the summit of the capitol!" pp. 146–149.

The paper on IRVING is less a biographical study than the egoing. Irving was alive when it was written, and it is inly a disquisition on Irving's writings, and principally his fe of Washington. Beautifully written like the others, it is emarkably just and discriminating appreciation of the characteristic qualities of Irving's genius. Of his style he thus eaks:

'His style possesses that exquisite charm which nothing but the study of books, ibined with that of nature, can give. You feel that he has drunk deep at the e wells of literature, and looked on men and nature with a loving heart. If le be a reflection of the mind, Mr. Irving's must be a beautiful one. And yet, irly marked as the characteristics of his style are, we are at a loss to seize upon secret of its power. It is natural, for you feel all the while you are reading , as if you ought to have written just so yourself. It is simple, for there is not overstrained expression or a cumbrous epithet in it. It is elegant, for it has all richness which imagery and language can give. It is picturesque, for it paints he eye like poetry. It is harmonious, for it falls on the ear like music. It is nsparent—the meadow-brook is not more so. And yet of these and of all the lities which it possesses in so eminent a degree, which are those that mark him as a writer by himself, and make it impossible for you to confound him with r other?

'One of them doubtless is his peculiar felicity in the choice of epithets. This s every writer knows, one of the greatest difficulties in the art of writing. It me thing to describe a scene accurately, another to throw into your description e happy expression which shall imprint it on the memory and become permaitly associated with it. It is the poet's gift, requiring quick sensibilities and a ly fancy. Mr. Irving has it in an eminent degree. He never plucks a flower hout seeing something in it that you never saw there before,—some connection ween the visible and the invisible world, some new alliance betwixt thought l feeling, which embalms it in odors richer than its own.

Then follow some comparisons of Irving's with Arnold's and Macaulay's style, very beautiful and very just, but we have not room for them; nor for some exquisite remarks upon Goldsmith, the qualities of his mind, and the resemblance between him and Irving.

In treating of Irving's Life of Washington, besides a brief but admirable review of the previous works on the same subject, we have some of the best, the most just and judicious remarks we remember ever to have read on the literary qualifications for historical composition, and a comparative estimate of the great historians, both ancient and modern, which evinces how widely and how well-read in history the writer is.

On Irving's historical style as compared with Prescott's and Bancroft's, we have also a disquisition as felicitously expressed as it is delicately discriminating in judgment;—of which we give only the concluding observations on Mr. Irving:

"If we were called upon to name the leading characteristics of his style, we should say that they were rhythm, artistic conception, and a constant play of fancy. It is to his delicate perception of rhythmical beauty that his sentences owe their just and harmonious proportions. It is by his rare power of artistic conception that he enriches them with pictures full of life and movement. And the vivid play of his fancy gathers for him, from the wide realms of animate and inanimate nature, that store of felicitous epithets which illuminates them as with a perpetual glow of soft and rosy light. You never willingly lay down a volume of his till you have finished it; and when you take it up anew, you still feel the pleasure grow upon you as you read. 'Fascinating' is the word that we should most readily apply to him as a writer, so irresistible is the influence which he gains over us, and so serene a sense of secret satisfaction does he diffuse through the mind by the graceful flow of his periods." p. 219.

We have room only for one extract more, and that is the writer's definitive estimate of the most general character and worth of Irving's last and greatest work:

"We think, therefore, that Mr. Irving has succeeded perfectly in the task which he had set himself,—a history of Washington which should bring him home to every heart by bringing him distinctly before every mind. A psychological analysis of character, like Coleridge's Pitt, or a philosophical generalization, like Guizot's Essay, however valuable for a certain class of readers,—and surely their value cannot be rated too highly,—would have failed to meet the wants of the thousands who wish to know what Washington did in order to win for himself the holy title of 'Father of his Country.' The historian of Washington is the great teacher of the nation, who tells us what sacrifices it cost our fathers to prepare for us the

ps that we enjoy; what heroism was required to overcome the obstacles that
eir path; what self-denial it demanded to forget themselves in their love for
y; how strong their wills, how firm their hearts, how sound their judgment,
ene their wisdom. We should rise from the volume with the whole of the
us history imprinted upon our memories, and with our hearts glowing with
gratitude and generous patriotism. We should feel that a great soul has
d open before us, and that we have been permitted to look into its inner-
ocesses; that we have been brought nearer to one in the touch of whose
ts are healing and strength; and that, henceforth, when trials come upon
doubts assail us, and our hearts sicken and grow faint at the contemplation
for which we can discover no cure, the image of the great and good man
before us like a messenger from heaven to teach us the power of faith and
ity of virtue. pp. 219–221.

conclude by expressing the satisfaction we feel in know-
at the life of General Greene, second in command of the
of the Revolution, the favorite general and trusted
of Washington, is to be given us by one so competent
task as this little volume proves his grandson to be.
shall we have the promised work?

Art. III.—THE CHURCH MISSIONARY POSITION OF 1835 AND VOLUNTARYISM.

1.—*Journals of General Conventions of* 1835 *and* 1859.

2.—*Address to their Brethren of the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Lay Committee appointed at the Session of the General Convention, October,* 1859. Philadelphia, 1860. 8vo, pp. 23.

3.—*Constitution, &c., of a New Missionary Society in* 1860.

The Missionary Work is the Church's Work.—This is our proposition. The world is to be converted to Christ. The Church is Christ's appointed instrumentality, by which that conversion is to be effected.

Christ instituted the Church. That Church was and is a Visible Church, an Organized Church, a corporate body. The New Testament Scriptures, and especially the later portions of these Scriptures, are full of the Church. They do not give directions how the Church should be constituted, for the Church was instituted, and fully and completely organized throughout a large portion of the world more than half a century before a portion of that volume was written, and more than a century and a half before it was fully determined what the Canonical Books of the New Testament are.

The New Testament Scriptures speak, and always speak, of the Church as an already existing *fact*, as something that *is*; they never tell us how it should be, or must be. In the *one hundred and fourteen* instances in which the Greek word, translated Church, occurs in the New Testament, there is not one in which the Church on earth is spoken of otherwise than as a Visible, organic, corporate body. Ignore it as we may, explain it as we may, the New Testament is full of this Churchly element, distinctively as such. The same men who wrote the New Testament Scriptures, founded the Christian Church. By supernatural direction, they changed the Old into the New

ıtion. They were as truly under Divine guidance in ey *did*, as in what they *wrote ;* and the supernaturalism lew Dispensation, and its Divine, perpetual, universal ın cannot be proved without reference to Apostolic as well as Apostolic writings. Nay, we cannot, as we d, decide what the Apostolic writings are, nor can we ertain Doctrines and Institutions vital to the Christian without this authoritative appeal to the Practice of ic times.

at Church as a Visible organic Body, Christ committed ionary Work, the work of bringing the world into true ith Himself, and so of obedience to the Father. He t Commission, not generally, not to the disciples in the it to the Apostles, as the representative, responsible and leaders of His Church. It was to the Apostles, chosen Ministers, that He said : "*All power is given in Heaven and on Earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach ons, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all hatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with ay even unto the end of the world. Amen.* (Matt. 8–20.) "*And when He had said this, He breathed on d said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosesoever sins t, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins a, they are retained.*" (John xx. 22–23.)

is the Missionary Work, committed by Christ Himself, the Church generally and indiscriminately, not to a ry Society in the Church, but to the appointed, repre- s, responsible Officers of the Church, *as such.* Yet it k in which all the Church have a share, in its labors, privileges and rewards, but each in their own order.

e body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if all say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? ole were hearing, where were the smelling? *But now hath God set s every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him.* And if they ne member, where were the body? But now are they many members, e Body. (1 Cor. xii, 14–20.)

The whole language of the Apostle in this remarkable chapter implies, beyond doubt, diversities of Order and of gifts, yet unity of interest, plans and object. This is the Divine plan of the Missionary Work. It was committed specially and exclusively to the Church as such; and, as the same Apostle says, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, *might be known* BY THE CHURCH the manifold wisdom of God."

Here then we have the argument for the position with which we started: that the Missionary Work is the Church's Work. Is there a flaw in the argument? Is there any appeal from it? Does it not settle, and beyond a peradventure, the question, how and by whom the Missionary Work is to be carried on? It is not the argument of expediency. It does not, at all, depend on another question, whether more interest could not be excited, and more money raised, on some other principle. Whatever body believes itself to be an *integral* portion of the One Body of Christ and maintains an organic form answering to that belief, that body *as such* is solemnly bound, by the express command of Christ, and by the very terms of the Charter under which its organization is defensible, to prosecute the Missionary Work. If we, the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, are an integral portion of the One Church of Christ, then are we under obligation *as such a Church*, to execute in our sphere the last Commission of our Ascended Lord. If we have not faith enough in the body to which we belong, to work for Christ in that way, we should, to be consistent, either say that Christ did not establish any Visible Church at all, or else we should seek membership in some organization which shall seem in our judgment to possess all the essential notes of the One Body of Christ. As members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we profess to know, and to be able most certainly to prove, that we have the Faith, the Sacraments, the Ministry which Christ Himself gave; and with this conviction, there is also among Churchmen a deepening consciousness and increasing sensibility as to the claims of the Missionary Work.

But this is not all. The Church was not only to publish

Gospel, she was also to protect the Faith. She was to be
e pillar and ground of the Truth." She is a Tower as
as a Vineyard; and her Ministers, Watchmen as well as
ionaries. Even if it were true, that for the time being,
ter individual activities could be secured by Voluntaryism
by Church effort, still the rallying of parties in the
rch around private doctrinal opinions and scholastic spec-
ons, is, so far, to rob the Church of her moral power; and
; is more, it is to take from her the ability to be what
st meant her to be, the Keeper of the *whole* Faith in its
ety. Here is one cardinal distinction between the Church
a Sect.* Besides, the History of the Church shows that
orary success is purchased at the price of ultimate defeat.
ich, from the language of Scripture, was the work which
st gave His Church to do. How did the Early Church under-
l this matter? Was that Church a Missionary Church? and
the work itself carried on as a Church work, distinctly as
? Or, was it done by a system of Voluntaryism, working
de and independent of the Church? It was a work by
Church, infused with the Life and Love of Christ, and, in
sense, voluntary. It was a work carried on in strict ac-
ance with the Divine plan, and hence Churchly. The
rch did not repose upon her Apostolicity, vote herself
ssionary Church, expend her zeal in eloquent Missionary
hes, and then attempt to hire men to do what she herself
no heart to do.

ither, on the other hand, did this Missionary zeal and ac-
r separate itself from the Visible Body of Christ, organize
into a rival opposition Society, and work independently of
Body. The Church was a living thing. Every Christian,
her of high or low degeee, whether Bishop, or Presbyter,
eacon, whether Layman, or Laywoman, felt that he or she

---

ere we have the answer to one argument, lately put forth, in behalf of the
ociety: "*Reasons for Organizing the American Church Missionary Society.*
resbyter." Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1860; 12mo. pp. 24. If the argu-
f this pamphlet is valid, its application does not cease with the rending of
ssionary Society; it should disintegrate and so destroy the Church alto-

had a work to do for Christ, and yet that it was a work to be done in Christ's way, and in that way only.

The early History of the Church is an illustration of this statement. Of the Apostles, Eusebius tells us* that Apollonius, who lived as early as the close of the Second Century, "says, as from tradition, that our Saviour commanded his Apostles, that they should not, for the space of twelve years, depart from Jerusalem." Clement of Alexandria, also, mentions the same fact as to the scene of the Apostles' labors for the first twelve years after the Ascension.† The New Testament‡ concurs with tradition in showing that the Apostles did remain in Jerusalem about that, or even more than that length of time. Afterwards, they went forth into different and distant countries, publishing the Gospel and establishing Churches.—Eusebius tells us§ that

"The holy Apostles of our Saviour, *being dispersed over the whole world, preached the Gospel.* And Thomas, as tradition hath it, had Parthia allotted to him: Andrew had Scythia; John, Asia, where, after he had spent much time, he died at Ephesus. Peter, 'tis probable, preached to the Jews scattered throughout Pontus and Galatia, and Bithynia, and Cappadocia, and Asia; who, at last, coming to Rome, was crucified, with his head downwards; for so he desired to suffer. It is needless to say anything of Paul, who, having fully preached the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem unto Illyricum, at last suffered martyrdom, at Rome, in the time of Nero."

This twelve years of the Apostles at Jerusalem, taken in connection with the Forty Days of our Saviour between the Resurrection and the Ascension, and with the recorded fact that He was instructing them during that period concerning His Church, taken in connection, also, with the fact, that the Apostles were subsequently endowed with the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, for the very purpose of instituting and organizing the New Dispensation for all future time—we say, this fact gives to that portion of their history, and to their subsequent history infinite importance. Why were the Apostles thus together in a body for this long space of time? Our readers will see at a glance what the argument is. The argument is unanswerable, that is, if Christianity be indeed a

* Eccl. His., Lib. v. chap. 18.

† Stromat. Lib. vi.

‡ Acts viii. 1; Acts xv. 28; Gal. ii. 1.

§ Eccl. His., Lib. iii. chap. 1.

New Dispensation. With those that contend that it is not, we can have no argument on the subject.*

The important fact before us, however, is, that the Apostles themselves ultimately went forth into all the world as Missionaries of Christ. In their own lives, labors, sacrifices and deaths, they set forth before the world, and for the ages to come, the Church in that one glorious attitude in which she should ever be made to appear, a MISSIONARY CHURCH. "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." The Churchly character of their Missionary work is seen in the uniformity of the Organization, Ministry and Faith of the Churches which they planted. Tertullian says, "All Churches exhibit their first Bishops ordained by the Apostles, by whom the Apostolical seed was propagated and conveyed to others."† Bingham also concludes, that "the Order of Bishops was settled before the Canon of Scripture was concluded."‡

Of all the Apostles, however, the life of no one has been so fully narrated, as that of St. Paul. He was emphatically the Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles; and he was, in the truest sense, a Missionary Bishop. The whole argument, to prove that the Missionary Work is distinctively and emphatically the Church's Work, is embodied in that Apostle's life. He was himself clothed with full Apostolic power; yet he was, in the strictest sense, a Missionary; and his work was carried on everywhere as a Church work, and in an orderly and Churchly way. When his Missionary labors at Antioch were disturbed by certain Judaizing teachers, and the great question as to the identity of, or the distinction between the Jewish and Chris-

---

* In this connection, we beg to refer the reader to Ireneus' testimony to the Apostles' Creed. As is well known, he was born, as some say, A. D., 97; was a learned and devout man; was Bishop of Lyons; and he tells us, that he had, himself, seen Polycarp, who was a personal disciple of the Apostle St. John. Ireneus does not profess to repeat the Creed, he only describes it, and he could not have described it more exactly. They who contend that Creeds are of modern date, or that there was no uniformity in the Creeds and the Ministry of the Apostolic Church, that Creeds and Ministry are of little consequence, only betray their own ignorance and folly.

† Tertul. De Præs. Haer. sec. 32.

‡ Bingham, Book II. chap 1, sec. iii. See also chaps. 1, 2, 3.

tian Dispensations came to be settled, St. Paul referre whole matter to the Synod, or Council, or Convention Apostles, and Presbyters, and Laymen in session at Jeru (This was before the Pope's time.)

So also in the Churches which he planted in his fou sionary journeys, between the years, A.D. 45 and 65, (so A. D. 68) three only of which are narrated by St. Luke, e is known, even from the New Testament Scriptures, to how those Churches were organized. Titus was app Bishop of Crete, to "set in order the things that are wa and ordain Elders (Presbyters) in every city."* A Paul's two Epistles to Timothy, whom he had made Bis Ephesus, recognize fully and unequivocally the same and functions of the Episcopate as vested in Timothy, from the Apostolic age to the present time have been re as appertaining to that high office.

In respect to all the minute details in carrying on the of Missions in Apostolic times, some things are clearly some are only intimated, and some are left to conjectur certainly is true that the Apostles went forth as Missio yet not alone and unattended, and that they exercised g mental superintendence over the Churches which they pl It is also equally true that others besides the Apostles forth as Missionaries into new fields as the first heralds Cross. Philip, the Deacon, first preached the Gospel i maria, before the Apostles visited that City;† and ye certain that the Apostles superintended the planting Church there. Subsequently Philip is found south of J lem on his way towards Egypt, where he met the eunuch baptized him.‡ Afterward, he is found at Azotus, in the of Palestine; and thence he passed on, and "preached the cities till he came to Cesarea,"§ where he subsequ seems to have made his permanent residence.‖ But the history of Philip shows that he acted, not independent disorderly, but in strict subordination to the law and go ment of the Church.

* Titus i. 5. † Acts viii. 5–14. ‡ Acts viii. 26
§ Acts viii, 40. ‖ Acts xxi. 8 & 9.

So also the "Seventy Disciples" whom our Saviour called l sent forth,* doubtless after His Ascension, were among the rly Missionaries of the infant Church. Yet the Primitive thers seem to have known little of them, or rather to have on record almost nothing as to their labors.† But this great fact everywhere meets us, and this is the point now ore us, that, as soon as Churches were planted, and planted in all parts of the then known world, whose history has come rn to us, those Churches are always found organized in one, l only one way, and professing one, and only one Faith. ariably, and without one exception, these Churches are al- s found having Bishops, in our acceptation of that term. n Calvin admitted this as a fact of History. We add here, t it is also equally true, that all our modern popular no- ns of the Episcopate, even among Churchmen, are, in sev- l most important respects, as unscriptural and unprimitive they well can be.‡

The History of the early Councils of the Church, too, Pro- cial as well as General, their construction and the principles ich governed them, do not permit us to doubt how the ly Churches were planted, or on what principle Apos- c Missions were conducted. There is but one explanation sible of a fact which is so universal that primitive history nishes not a single exception.

Here then we have our second great argument. On these two unds, Scriptural teaching and Scriptural practice, we are tent to rest this whole question ; and on such testimony we rn once more that the MISSIONARY WORK IS THE CHURCH'S RK. She has no right to transfer that work into other ds. No man, no body of men, has a moral right to take t work from her ; most certainly not, unless she proves ant to her duty. She herself must do that work, and must do it in CHRIST'S way. We must give up the Church rely, as a Divine institution, or we must abide by this con- ion. Church Missions are not an anomaly in the Church, ormal in their character, and to be carried on in an irregu-

* Luke, x. 1–17. † See Eusebius' Eccl. His. i. 12.
‡ See Eusebius' Eccl. His., books ii. iii. iv. v.

lar way. They flow from, and belong to, the very life of the Church in her true capacity as the very Body of Christ.

It will not perhaps strengthen our argument, yet we observe again that Primitive Missions, conducted so as we have seen, were eminently successful. The testimony to this fact is familiar to many of our readers; yet we shall give a few illustrations.

The statement of the Younger Pliny to the Roman Emperor, as to the spread of the Gospel in Pontus and Bithynia, and the regions of Asia Minor, in the early part of the Second Century is unqualified, and need not be repeated.

Justin Martyr, about the middle of the Second Century, writes:

"There is not a nation, either of Greek, or Barbarian, or of any other name—either nomadic or living in tents—amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and the Creator of the Universe, in the name of the crucified Jesus.*

Ireneus, about A. D. 175, speaks of the "Church," "as being scattered over the whole world, even unto the ends of the earth;" and he mentions in particular "the Churches which are in Germany," "the Churches among the Iberi" (or Spaniards) and "the Celtic Gauls," and those of "the East," as well as of "Egypt and Lybia," and those of the "more central parts of the world."†

Tertullian, near the close of the Second Century, says:

"We were but of yesterday, yet we have filled your country, the cities, the islands, the castles, the free towns, the irregular settlements, the different bodies of citizens, the palace, the Senate, and the Forum;" and, in his Tract against the Jews, after enumerating the whole list of nations mentioned in Acts ii. 9, 10 and 11, he names, "Various tribes of the Getuli, and many of Mauritanian nations: all the clans of Spaniards, and diverse nations of the Gauls, and parts of Britain inaccessible to the Romans, but subject to Christ; and portions of the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians, and of many unexplored nations and provinces, and islands, which he was unable to enumerate, in all which places, the name of Christ (he says) now reigns."‡

This testimony is enough to prove, that by the close of the Second Century, the Church of Christ had become firmly planted, and the Christian Faith truly received by vast multitudes among all the most civilized and enlightened, as well as the more barbarous nations on the face of the earth.

* Dial. cum Tryph., p. 345; ed., Paris, 1636.

† Adv. Haeres. Lib. i. Cap, ii. & iii; ed. Basle, 1533.

‡ Op. Tert., Lipsiae, 1839, Pars, iv., p. 303.

e bearing of this whole subject upon the Missionary Work
r own Branch of the Church at the present day is obvious.
:, since Apostolic times, was there such a field opened for
onary labor as our own country now presents. And
thstanding the indifference to the work, which still char-
ses so large a portion of the Church, her growth through
onary effort during the last quarter of a century, and
1835, as the statistics which we shall give presently will
has been simply and truly wonderful.

at Year of Grace, 1835, formed a new era in the history of
merican Church. A Missionary spirit had been exhibited in
hurch, almost from her organization; but these faithful
s were, comparatively, scattered, single-handed, and alone.
320, a Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society was
d, and a great point was gained; but the Society was
tary in its principle, and was composed only of those who
buted a certain amount to its funds. The Church in
al Convention, in 1835, openly took the ground, THAT
HURCH, AS SUCH, IS HERSELF ONE GREAT MISSIONARY
TY; AND THAT EVERY PERSON WHO IS ADMITTED WITHIN
'ALE BY BAPTISM, BECOMES THEREBY A MEMBER OF THE
ONARY SOCIETY, IN THE HIGHEST SENSE OF THE TERM,
S SACREDLY BOUND TO LABOR IN ITS BEHALF. We shall
forget what a new pulsation of life and power, what a
thrill of holy joy went forth through all our parishes,
that primitive Scriptural axiom was announced from
ulpit and the press, as having the sanction and authority
e highest Ecclesiastical Council of the Church in our
The heart of the Church felt in its inmost depths, that
vas placing the duty and the work of Missions on the
ground. And, from that day forward, the cause of the
:h has been gloriously onward.

e come now to another point in our discussion. Recently,
nore especially since the last General Convention at Rich-
, there has been developed a spirit of another character in
:t to the work of Missions. There has been manifested
d determination to break down our present Missionary Sys-
to change the whole plan of the Missionary work, and to

substitute in its place a mere system of Voluntaryism, based on individual doctrines and Ecclesiastical opinions and affinities.

We might have supposed that the changes now going on in the Methodist and Presbyterian bodies, in this very matter, would have put every man, who claims to be a Churchman, on his guard. Among the Methodists, it is this very Voluntaryism, this departure from the organic principles of the denomination, which Dr. Stevens, their ablest writer, thus describes: "After throwing us into general confusion and exasperation, it now threatens our unity and prospects as a Church."

Among the Presbyterians, the tendency is in another direction. Even the New School Presbyterians have been compelled to cut themselves entirely free from the Congregationalists, after a disastrous union of twenty-five years, in what was called the "Home Missionary Society," and to organize their Mission movements upon a strictly denominational basis. The Old School Presbyterians have taken higher ground. At their late General Assembly at Rochester, that body, after a long, able and excited debate, which consumed eight days, at last by a vote of 240 to 60, or 4 to 1, affirmed the principle, that, in the language of its own chronicler, "It is the duty of the Church, *in its organic capacity*, to be a Missionary Society, preaching the Gospel to every creature."*

And the same writer says, that "the impression is becoming more and more deep in the Presbyterian mind, that [this is] the wisest and most Scriptural way of managing the benevolent movements of the day." We thank our Presbyterian friends for such a testimony, though we regret to quote it in such a connection.† It is a striking fact, also, and worth remembering just now by Churchmen, that among the arguments urged in the Presbyterian Assembly for *giving up* Voluntaryism was "*the inefficiency of the system.*" Men, it seems, will for a little while, give money pretty freely on the "rule or

* New York Observer, June 7, 1860.

† If any of our readers wish to see what Voluntaryism is, and in a field where it has had a free and full development, we refer them to Catherine E. Beecher's "Appeal to the People in behalf of their Rights as Authorized Interpreters of the Bible." The facts there presented, and the views inculcated, are worth examining by any one who has a hankering after the System.

principle, or to sustain a party based on private opinion ; his is a sort of motive power which soon exhausts itself, hey are glad to come back again to the old ground.

this new movement in the Church towards Voluntaryism, ıd, as we supposed, the complete history. Since the greater of our Article was written, we are credibly informed that of the early counsels and deliberations respecting it, so om being open and above board, were "held under the f secresy." We are necessarily limited, therefore, in our nents, to what these gentlemen have been pleased to pub- o the world. It appears that, after some primary steps een taken, a public Meeting was invited, and held in the ch of the Ascension, in New York City, April 11, 1860 :

consider the propriety of establishing a New Missionary Society of the al Church in the United States and Territories. About *sixty* persons were from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, nd and Virginia. After the Meeting was opened with prayer, the Rev. ng, as Chairman of a former Committee, stated, he had received *sixty-four* from different persons in regard to a New Society. *Eight* letters were in ion; *nine*, undecided; and *forty-seven*, in favor of forming a New Society."

ter a protracted session, the Meeting was adjourned to the morning, when, a much smaller number being present, after much discussion, the following Resolutions were ıd :

solved, That, in the judgment of this meeting, the *Voluntary* principle in the n Work is the true principle.

solved, That a Committee of *five* be appointed to consider and report to a g, to be held in New York, Wednesday, May 9th, what action may be neces- carry out the above resolution, either by the organization of a new Volun- ciety or Societies; or by the modification of any existing Society."*

iis Meeting at New York divulged the character of the movement, and its ultimate designs. We are informed, not a single Bishop of the Church advised to the forma- of the New Society ; so that the project became thence- ırd, in spirit, *un-* if not *anti*-Episcopal. Several of the ops, and many of the leading Presbyters in New York, ıdelphia, and Boston, who were confidently relied upon to character to the project, utterly refused to have anything

* *Southern Churchman*, April 20th, 1860.

to do with it; while they, who were in favor of doing something, were irreconcilably at disagreement as to what that something should be.

At this point in the proceedings, it is a little amusing, that the venerable Chairman of the Committee, the Rev. Dr. Tyng, who hitherto had been a leading spirit in the movement, and whose "Sixty-four Letters" had been reported to the Meeting, suddenly came to the conclusion, that in his advancing years the cares of his Parish were quite enough to engage his attention, and that he must leave the active management of this new movement in younger hands. And yet, Dr. Tyng finds time to be a stated contributor to the *New York Independent*, the most rabid, ultra, Abolition paper that comes under our observation. And at the late Anniversary of the Abolition section of the American Tract Society, held in the famous Dr. Cheever's "Church of the Puritans," in New York, May 10th, he made a speech, in which he said:

"He was glad the anniversary was held in this "Church of the Puritans," where Puritan truths are spoken, and tongues would not remain silent. He himself was a Puritan, and, because he was a Puritan, he could never stoop to the dirty work of pandering to the sin of Slavery. He dared to speak the truth, and, if need be, to fight for it, and he was glad to find that a society had at length been formed, where truths might be spoken without fear or favor. We send across Mason and Dixon's line our agents, our colporteurs, and, if those to whom we send them burn their tracts and papers, the ashes thereof become like those of the martyrs. We have two of these men at the present time in the Slave States."*

* The mischievous, wicked designs of the infatuated men, with whom Dr. Tyng has chosen to associate himself, may not be known to all our readers. Active interference with Slavery in the Slave States is their avowed object, and is now being attempted through the power of associated action, and by heavy contributions. We have before us a Report of an Anniversary Meeting of the "American Missionary Association," held in Boston, May 31st, 1860. The Association has its headquarters in New York, and is supported by the "*Orthodox*" Congregationalists and Presbyterians in all the Northern States. Here are their principles, as avowed by themselves: "The Association has occasion also to rejoice that the principles, announced by it more than thirteen years ago, are prevailing; that there are a largely increased number of Christians who believe that the churches should everywhere relieve themselves from all connection with slavery, by refusing admission to slaveholders, *and by laboring for its overthrow.* The great Head of the Church has signally blessed the cause during the past year. *Imprisonment and exile have, it is true, befallen some of our missionaries in the Slave States;* but they anticipated, like the Apostle to the Gentiles, that bonds, stripes, and imprisonment awaited them. *We cannot give up the Slave States. They must have an unadulterated Gospel.* It is

We observe that the name of Dr. Tyng appears as a promi-ent Officer in the new Society; and we suggest to our breth-n in the South as well as the North, who are striving to sub-itute for our present Missionary Church organization, a -stem of Voluntaryism based on private doctrinal opinions -d on sympathy with modern theories of Christian reform, -nd here we touch a great principle which really underlies this -ole question,) that they will, not unlikely, have enough of before they are through with it.

An adjourned Meeting was held at the Sunday School room the "Church of the Ascension," May 9th, when "a major-r of the Committee reported that it was desirable to form a -w Voluntary Society for the carrying on of the work in the -mestic field." Such was the spirit of determination, that the declaration was made by some who were present, that e *New Independent Society would be formed, even if com-nced by two or three persons.** A New Society was formed, be called "The American Church Missionary Society," and Constitution, Statement, and Appeal, &c., have been sent, suppose, throughout the length and breadth of the Church. is but fair, however, to say, that the New Society is de-ribed differently, even by its own friends, both as to its pro-sed practical workings, and as to the strength which is edged to it. All agree, however, as to its thorough Volun-ryism, its utter irresponsibility to all Church control, and its -en antagonism to the organic Missionary operations of the hurch.

The special and immediate incentive to the formation of this ew Missionary Voluntary Society seems to have been the -ction of the two gentlemen, who were chosen by the last eneral Convention at Richmond, as Missionary Bishops, the

---

rt of the mission of this Association to tender it to them." That unmitigated il, utter ruin to both master and slave, and this alone, would be the result of suc-sful interference on the part of these men—that their conduct is more than a stake—that it is criminally wrong, is the judgment of those who are qualified to -ve an opinion on the subject. The position which the Church has hitherto main-ined on this whole subject is the only true and wise one, and is certainly sanc-ned both by the precepts and example of JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles.

* *Ep. Recorder*, June 23d, 1860.

Rt. Rev. Dr. Lay, for the South West, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Talbot, for the North West. Nobody has ever charged them with being ultra or extreme men ; nobody has ever denied that they are men eminently qualified by nature and by grace for the arduous duties and the self-sacrificing labors to which, by the nomination of the House of Bishops, and the unanimous voice of the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates, they have been called. Yet, scarcely had the jubilant notes of joy and praise died away in the Church over this accession to our Missionary forces, when the following language, and sentiments like it, were scattered over the Church : "At the last General Convention in Richmond, by the understood compromise, we were entitled to one of the new Bishops ; we got neither, but are earnestly exhorted to support them. Things have come to a crisis. *Delay is defeat.*"* The *Protestant Churchman* says : "The working of the Domestic department has given High Church Bishops to Wisconsin, Arkansas, California, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Texas. Oregon is only claimed as doubtful." Are we uncharitable in saying, that, if language means anything, we have here the whole thing in a nutshell. It is not principle, that is contended for—it is power. It is said, almost in so many words, "Bad as your principles are, give us one of the New Missionary Bishops, and you may have the other." The very Missionary work of the Church, its sacrifices and self-denials, are regarded as matter of traffic for the aggrandizement of a party. We leave such a motive to those who are capable of appreciating it.

As to this "compromise," which it is said has been violated, and of which we never heard till lately, the whole thing is, in the very nature of the case, an utter absurdity. Who made that "compromise ?" Who authorized them to make it ? When was it made, and where ? What were its terms ? What were its limitations as to time ? How "High" must a man be, or how "Low," to be ruled out, or ruled in, by its specifications ? Was the late Kansas Election an illustration of its practical working ? The real truth is, that any such test of

* *Southern Churchman*, May 18th, 1860.

Churchmanship, or any test, other than the Prayer Book in its plain and obvious meaning, is unmeaning and utterly impracicable. With the rapid growth of our country, with the fearful increase among us of irreverence, lawlessness, and false independence, the heart of the nation is turning more and more ward the Church; and, mainly, because the Church, while e holds the Gospel in its primitive simplicity and power, is so supposed to foster in society a spirit of loyalty to Law and rder. She does foster it. If this is High Churchism, as opsed to ultra, self-willed individualism, and to every man's ing what is right in his own eyes, such High Churchism is increase more and more among us; and no man, and no set men, can prevent it. It is a felt want, an indispensable cessity of the times. Men are seeking after it, and they will nd it; and they will find it with us, or they will find it somehere else. It is not long since the ablest, shrewdest advocate the Romish Church in this country presented that Church the American people, as the very element of conservatism hich alone can save the nation from utter chaos and ruin. ust now, however, these men have quite enough on their ands in taking care of Pius IX. and Francis II. Meanwhile, othing but the sheerest madness, nothing but spiritual deadss and blindness to her opportunity, can prevent the Church om rising, almost at once, to the dignity and majesty of a mmanding power in the land. Thank God for the noble earts whom He is raising up in every portion of the Church, ll of faith and might, who see and feel what the work is, hich Christ calls upon His Church to do.

It is in this aspect of the Church, as well as in her Missiony character, (and it is the same principle in a two-fold relaon,) that the last General Convention presented a memorale scene. That Convention comprised a large amount of the st talent, Clerical and Lay, of the whole nation, and of every ction of the country. Suddenly events transpired about them fearful import, blanching the cheeks, and filling the hearts men, women, and children with terror; and none could tell ow deeply and widely the plot had been laid. Men saw that e plot was the natural result of the teachings of men who

claim to be Christians *par excellence*, that it might have been expected, and is sure to be repeated with the opportunity. The members of that Convention read at a glance the lesson of God's Providence. They felt, as they had never felt before, that our glorious Church has a great destiny to fulfil in this our New Republic, if she is only true to herself; and they were humbled under a sense of the responsibilities of their position. They felt, and they all felt alike, that it was a time to kneel, and pray, and work together for Jerusalem's sake, and for the City of our God; not to quarrel with each other, much less to chaffer over the spoils of Office in the Church of Christ.

The same Catholic conservative character of the Church was asserted by that Convention in its Missionary action. As the Bishop of Georgia has beautifully said, in his Address to his late Convention, "All the Missionary claims upon the Convention were fully met, *and the Church most completely vindicated her title to being* THE *Great Missionary Society of the World.*"

That Convention also appointed a Committee of Laymen, consisting of one from each Diocese, which should take into consideration, and devise and carry out such means and measures as they might deem advisable, for supporting and invigorating the Christian efforts of the Church in all its departments.* The Committee have entered resolutely and zealously upon the duties to which the Church has called them. The Address whose title we have placed at the head of our Article, is able, well-considered, and breathes a spirit, not only of the loftiest patriotism, but one which, in its Christian breadth of grasp and depth of tone, only needs to penetrate our whole Church to produce wonderful and glorious results. Representing every portion of the country and of the Church, the carefully weighed words of these gentlemen are specially important in their bearing upon the great question now before us. They say:

"The Church in this country is peculiarly a missionary body. * * * Every member of the Church, as such, is a member of its missionary organizations. * * * We have not deemed ourselves authorized to devise or recommend new or doubtful schemes of untried efficacy, or to give undue prominence to any special agencies, however commendable. * * * The great work now committed to our

* Journal of Convention, pp. 134–6.

much too large to permit us to engage in any idle or trifling controversy. *ued Unity of the Church, the great secret and source of her power, is inestimably* s. Let it never be endangered by any fault of ours, but let us ever remem- d carefully cherish that golden rule, so easy to observe—IN ESSENTIALS, ; IN NON-ESSENTIALS, LIBERTY; IN ALL THINGS, CHARITY."

erything is showing that the heart of the Church has be- sick of party. The unanimous vote of the House of cal and Lay Delegates in the late election of the Mission- Bishops, and similar events of the last ten years to which eed not here allude, prove conclusively that it will be ut- in vain to attempt to perpetuate in the Church of the ure the party issues and personal alienations of bygone Some man, it may be, perched in his own little eyrie, ling apart from his brethren, may still brood over an old party ggle which cast him from place and power, and may deem eachery to heal up the old wounds. Not unlikely, too, r organs may still continue to stir up more or less of mis- and distrust among simple-hearted laymen and lay- en; but the glory of party has departed; the old party are fast being obliterated. Our Church Missionary work powerful alembic. Love is a great solvent. When breth- rom the East, and West, and North, and South, come to- er, and join heart and hand in the common work and love hrist, and learn to know and love each other, they feel how ıg it was, that they should ever have felt suspiciously, and en harshly of each other. Such a noble spectacle of true stian Brotherhood did the late General Convention present, all hearts were melted into thanks and praise to Almighty

here is another distinguishing feature of this new Society h is worth noting. It is ruled, that the presiding Officer he Society shall be a Layman; and one half of all its ers are also required to be Laymen, by the Constitution of Society. Now we have no sympathy with those who would ude Laymen from the Councils of the Church; we are too itive for that. There are posts of honor and spheres of rity which belong to them, and for which this portion of One Body of Christ is admirably fitted; but if there is

one department of Church responsibility and Church work which, more than another, and for every reason, belongs to Christ's chief Ministers, it is the selection, the appointment, the sending forth, the protection and the guardianship of men, bearing Christ's Commission, authorized to administer His Sacraments, suitably qualified to preach His Gospel and to edify His Church. The Ministry surely should be worthy to be entrusted with such a responsibility. If they are fit to be Bishops and Presbyters at all, they are fit to do this very work which Christ specially placed in their charge. And, with the earnest zeal which the whole Church now exhibits in this cause, with our noble band of Missionary Bishops heading and leading on the van, we do say that, for a New Society, started in open opposition to the stand which the Church herself has authoritatively taken, to ignore and renounce, in such a matter as this, and by its very Constitution, those whom Christ has made the Missionary leaders and rulers of His Church, is a very remarkable position. And, at this day, when no efforts are spared to alienate from each other the Clergy and Laity, when, to this end, watchwords are thrown out to arouse popular prejudice, such a marked feature of the New Society will be regretted by all true lovers of the Church, whatever their ecclesiastical or doctrinal affinities.

In this connection we shall allude briefly to another matter. An insinuation is sometimes, and with some people, stronger than an argument. In some of the papers which uphold the new party movement it is thrown out, not unfrequently of late, that not only the orthodoxy, but the purity of the Church is emphatically in the guardianship of a certain party. If any inference is to be drawn in the present connection, that inference is, that their standard of personal character, and of practical piety, is so much higher than that of their brethren that the welfare of the Church demands a separate organization for carrying on the work of Christian Missions. A late English paper, in speaking of a case precisely in point, says: "among religious phenomena, it is often found that an assumption of great grace and profound piety goes along with conduct which men of the world would think dishonorable." In the face of

ood deal of very noisy and not very modest Pharisaism
lly reiterated week after week, we do not hesitate to say that
onopoly of the Christian virtues and of personal piety is
in the possession of any one party among us; and that,
ny body chooses to raise an issue upon this point, it will
unlikely be made to appear so. There are some things
ich never advertise themselves, though their counterfeits do;
l of these, piety, and "evangelical" piety too, is one. The
y claim to a possession of all the virtues is proof positive
t one of them at least is wanting. To speak plainly, op-
ed as we are to party organization as wrong in principle,
here declare openly and publicly that we will not permit
inuations of this sort to be used for such an end. We
an precisely what we say. There are those who will know
t what we do mean. If comparisons not only of orthodoxy,
t of practical morality and personal character, are to be used
arguments here, we shall demand that these arguments be
d fairly, that these comparisons be made thoroughly. If
spirit of party is determined for its own party ends to rend
Church with schism, and to hinder the great work of
sions, to which the Church, as such, has pledged herself, it
ll do it on other grounds than this. It is an ungracious
sion, it would be a still more ungracious demonstration.
e responsibility of the one does not, and of the other shall
t, rest on us. All that we say, and that much we are com-
led to say, is, that this is a method of argument which
st not be used on such a subject. Churchmen, who are
nestly and quietly laboring and praying for more of the
usion of the Life of Christ in the heart of the Church, and
more of the diffusion of the Gospel of Christ at the hands
the Church, though they may bear in silence the silly
ng, the cruel slander, of not being "evangelical," yet when
ir personal piety and their standard of Christian morality
persistently impugned, they shall be protected from such
assault, coming from such a source, and having only such
end in view.

The only other argument for this new scheme of Voluntaryism
ich we have seen, is drawn from the precedent of the English

Church Missionary Societies. They, it is said, are voluntary in their principle and have been eminently successful. To this, it is enough to reply, that that Church can offer, in this regard, no sort of precedent to us. Bound hand and foot in State fetters for two hundred years; forbidden, even now, to alter an old unimportant Canon, save at the bidding of a Parliament comprising the deadliest enemies of the Church, Papists, Radicals and Jews, her Missionary work through Voluntary Associations is a matter of sheer necessity. Nor does the revival of Convocation in our own times affect this question. For that body has not touched the Missionary Work except indirectly, while by its very Constitution the Lay element of the Church is entirely excluded. In our own General Convention, however, as in the First Council at Jerusalem, all Orders in the Church, Bishops, Presbyters and Laymen, are fully and fairly represented.

We may observe here, that there is not an argument for Church Missions as such, not an affirmation of the fact of the substantial doctrinal agreement of Churchmen on the basis of the Catholic Creeds and of the comparative unimportance of the private opinions on which they differ; not a rebuke for strife, and alienation, and schism; not a plea for unity of action and fraternal feeling in all those who kneel at a common Altar; not a declaration of the "necessary separation from many Christians" in order that, "with a good conscience," we may maintain and preserve that "Ministry which the Lord established," and which we have received "through an appointed Succession from the Apostles;" we say there is nothing of all this which the Rev. Dr. Tyng himself has not presented, and in the strongest language of which he is capable, in his famous Sermon, "A PLEA FOR UNION," from Acts vii. 26, "Sirs, ye are Brethren," delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, Sept. 6th, 1844. The republication of that Sermon now would be a conclusive answer to every "plea" for Voluntaryism and Schism which has lately been put forth. The deep solemnity of manner with which Dr. Tyng declared those sentiments to be the mature conviction of his understanding, and the sober judgment of his conscience, and the

culiar circumstances under which they were uttered,
connection with his present position, are positively
, and suggest the gravest reflections.

half of our Church Missionary Organization we shall
to no elaborate defence. The great principle on which it
have already stated, and, we hope, sustained. Some
objections to the practical working of the System, we
ticed in our examination of the new Society. The
, indeed the only serious charge brought against our
ary System is that "it has proved a failure," and on
int we shall presently have something to say. Every
ows that, in 1835, when the Missionary enterprise of
rch began to take definite form, and the interest in
f united action was specially directed to the Foreign
at this department of Missions fell by general consent
he control of men then called "Low" Churchmen;
men of a different type of Churchmanship have always
firm and liberal supporters. Until about this period,
parative weakness of the Church throughout the whole
, the obstacles which she had been forced to contend
r since the close of the Revolutionary War, may well
for an apparent indifference to Missions abroad.

stic Missions passed, almost of course, into the hands
holding more positive Church views. These Missions,
lacking system and organic unity, had already awakened
terest than is now generally supposed. The "Report
Committee on the Domestic and Foreign Missionary
" to the General Convention of 1835, states:

clesiastical history will show, that, at a very early period after the or-
of the Church, her sympathy was expressed for those whom poverty had
from her courts and altar, and driven westwardly. * * The 'Act for
Missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers,' passed in the Gen-
ntion, A.D. 1792, (Journals p. 130,) and the Resolution of the same
95, (Journals, p. 145,) on the same subject; the appointment of the Com-
he Convention of New York for Propagating the Gospel, since merged
ssionary and Education Society; the Society for the Advancement of
y in South Carolina; the Societies bearing a like name in Pennsylvania
ia; the Missionary Societies and regulations (we have it not in our power
em) which we believe exist in each Diocese without exception; the in-
1820, of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society; the modifica-

tion of its Constitution made from time to time, and other circumstances, * * * these facts are so many evidences that the Missionary spirit of this Church has at no time been dead or asleep."*

When, after the new position of 1835 had been taken, the Domestic field began to assume new importance, and at a time when party animosities were unusually virulent, for the sake of conciliation the character of the Domestic Committee was changed as to its Churchmanship, and men known to be emphatically moderate and conservative were placed upon it, simply to relieve the Missionary work of all possible obstacles on this score.† That arrangement, well designed as it was, and wholly unobjectionable as these gentlemen were and are, cost Domestic Missions the temporary loss of the sympathy and hearty support of many Churchmen, who knew then, as they know now, precisely how much conciliation and compromise are worth under such circumstances. Still they yielded and kept silent. Next in the history of conciliation came the agreement with the "Missionary Association for the West," by which the Domestic Committee became the mere agents of the donors, appointed as its Missionaries every man whom that Association nominated, and faithfully transmitted the funds as directed. Fair-minded and honorable men all over the Church, East and West, North and South, feel and acknowledge, that every just cause of complaint has been removed; that the basis of our Missionary action has been made as broad as the standards of the Church herself; that, on principle, the Missionary Organization of the Church is beyond the reach of objection; that Prayer Book Churchmen, whether "High" or

---

* Journal of Gen. Conv. of 1835, pp. 121–2.

† The following are the Committees of the present Board.

DOMESTIC.—Rt. Rev. HORATIO POTTER, D.D., LL.D., *Chairman*. Rev. F. L. HAWKS, D.D., LL.D., Rev. J. H. HOBART, D.D., Rev. S. COOKE, D.D., Rev. P. S. CHAUNCEY, D.D., Rev. R. B. VAN KLEECK, D.D., Hon. LUTHER BRADISH, CURTIS CURTISS, Esq., G. N. TITUS, Esq., J. D. WOLFE, Esq., ISAAC SEYMOUR, Esq.

FOREIGN.—Rt. Rev. HORATIO POTTER, D.D., LL.D., *Chairman*. Rev. S. H. TURNER, D.D., Rev. WM. BACON STEVENS, D.D., Rev. JOHN COTTON SMITH, Rev. WM. A. MUHLENBERG, D.D., Rev. S. D. DENISON, *Sec. and Gen. Agent*. STEWART BROWN, Esq., LEWIS CURTIS, Esq., JAMES F. DE PEYSTER, Esq., FREDERICK S. WINSTON, Esq., JAMES S. ASPINWALL, Esq., *Treasurer*.

ow," whether Calvinist or Arminian, can, if they will, labor
armony in the Missionary field, as members of the One
y of Christ. The Missionary platform should not be a
's breadth narrower than the Prayer Book. A truly Catho-
Church must have its outer walls and battlements, but
must be far enough apart to include a St. Paul and a
ames, a Laud and a Hooker, a Heber and a Wilson, a
ury and a White. Liberty there must be in the Church,
not the liberty to anathematize within the limits which the
rch herself has drawn.

at it is said, "our present Missionary Organization has
d to do its duty to our great West." And another appeal
he new Society says, "that the present system has *failed*,
elieve there are few that doubt." This is a serious charge,
we shall treat it as such.

he word "failure," here, must be a somewhat relative term.
ay that our Missionary Organization has "failed" to per-
ate party spirit and party bitterness in the Church, would
e far out of the way. To say that the Church herself,
her Catholic Creeds, and these alone, as her Articles of
h, "fails" to satisfy men who deem the Five Points of
Calvin the sum and substance of the Gospel, may be very
; and it has, possibly, something to do with the whole
tion now before us. The pages of history show nothing
rancorous and unyielding than the spirit of genuine Cal-
m; and it is natural that it should be so. But to say that
Missionary System has failed, positively and absolutely, to
s own one great work, is, to use the mildest term that we
se, a most gross misstatement. To say that the Church
lone all that has been demanded of her by her opportuni-
nd abilities, would be an almost equal absurdity. We
ss too, that there have been, and there are now, a large
er of Parishes, "High" and "Low," in which the amount
issionary Collections for the last five years, is a burning
e and disgrace, to them, to their Pastors, and to the
ch. We would, if we could, and we mean as far as we
to awaken a public sentiment which shall reach these
hes and their Rectors. There is at least one argument

which the Church is steadily preparing to use, which some of these men by and by will feel. They must move forward, or be left behind. The Church calls for living, earnest, self-denying Christian men to head her onward progress, guide her counsels, and direct her measures; and she will find them. There are such men; and they will, by a natural law, sooner or later, get into their proper places.

But this dereliction of duty, as it happens, is not justly chargeable against any one class of Parishes or Rectors exclusively. Published facts show that faithfulness of appeal, and Missionary liberality in response to such appeal, are not regulated by any such arbitrary altitudinal distinctions of "High" and "Low." It should not be forgotten, furthermore, that our present Missionary system has been compelled to struggle not only with cold indifference, but decided opposition, such as may well account for the meagre support which it has enlisted in certain quarters. For instance, (and this is not the worst case of the kind), the Rector of a "Low" Church City Parish, himself surrounded by luxuries, a while since virtually prohibited an Agent of the "Spirit of Missions" from circulating that work among the people of his charge; and this, while our Foreign and Domestic Treasuries were well nigh bankrupt, and the Missionaries themselves were almost literally starving for lack of daily bread. Here is one secret of the stinted support, the feeble operations, with which our Foreign and Domestic Committees are charged. There has been a persistent, systematic, cruel withholding of material supplies, and then the hue and cry has been raised, that our Missionary Organization "has proved a failure;" they say, "There shall no straw be given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks."

But our Missionary System has not proved a failure. Its reflex influence upon the Church herself, where especially its power is sure to be felt, has been wonderful. Take, for instance, the Journals of our Diocesan Conventions, and we have nearly all of them before us, read the Addresses of the several Bishops to their respective Conventions, the records of their Annual Visitations, mark the notes which they give of Church activity and substantial and often rapid growth, quietly going on

throughout the length and breadth of our whole country, and see if our Missionary system has proved a failure.

Or, again, take any one of a large number of our principal cities, and compare the Church as it was in 1835, twenty-five years ago, with her present position in 1860. Take New York, or Brooklyn, or Philadelphia, or Baltimore, or Washington, or Charleston, or Mobile, or New Orleans, or Memphis, or Louisville, or St. Louis, or Chicago, or Milwaukee, or Buffalo, or Rochester, or Albany, or Providence, or Portland, or New Haven,* or Hartford; or take, almost at random, any one of a large number of our thriving towns and cities in the interior of the country; compare the Church at these two intervals of time in any one of these towns, and the contrast is marvellous And yet there is no surer way of testing the growth of the Church.

Or, take another department of strictly Missionary labor, of which nothing appears in our Missionary publications—our Diocesan Missions, thriving prosperously in nearly all the older Dioceses, and never prosecuted so vigorously as at the present day, and we shall see something of the life and energy with which the Church is now animated. There are some late instances of Church organization, and of Church life and growth, in the older Dioceses, which lead us to believe that the Church has within her a power of life and growth of which the great mass of Churchmen have no conception.

Take still another test. From the Journals of the General Conventions of 1835 and 1859, we have made out the following tabular statement of the condition of the Church at the two periods. Let him who will, examine this exhibition of Church progress in the last quarter of a century, and then, if he dare, pronounce the System a failure which has wrought out such results. The record of the number of families in the former Journal is too imperfect to draw a comparison in this respect.

---

* In 1835, New Haven, the stronghold of Puritanism, had two Parishes, two Churches, 530 Families, and 655 Communicants. In 1860, it has eight Parishes, nine Churches, 1272 Families, and 1712 Communicants.

DIOCESES.	CLERGY.		PARISHES.		COMMUNICANTS.	
	1835.	1859.	1835.	1859	1835.	1859.
Maine	5	19	5	17	167	1,442
New Hampshire	6	15	9	14	380	726
Massachusetts	38	83	37	71	1,783	7,780
Rhode Island	18	31	16	30	1,340	3,143
Vermont	17	28	30	38	1,000	1,998
Connecticut	71	131	88	118	4,800	11,575
*New York	194	470	214	431	9,738	35,325
New Jersey	32	103	35	85	908	5,000
Pennsylvania	79	193	86	201	3,623	14,106
Delaware	6	19	....	25	355	998
Maryland	66	159	....	126	3,006	10,580
Virginia	71	113	....	150	3,500	7,481
North Carolina	23	47	38	63	1,150	3,036
South Carolina	43	75	38	70	2,226	5,671
Georgia	6	26	5	27	264	1,998
Ohio	31	84	46	95	1,164	5,680
Kentucky	14	32	7	33	265	1,936
Mississippi	3	32	....	35	13	1,400
Tennessee	13	27	14	21	152	1,300
Alabama	3	30	7	37	61	1,673
Michigan	8	49	10	49	200	2,701
Illinois	7	61	....	96	39	3,000
Florida	....	8	....	15	....	630
Louisiana	....	36	....	42	....	1,667
Texas	....	13	....	24	....	700
Indiana	....	29	....	29	....	1,192
Missouri	....	28	....	29	....	1,395
Kansas	....	11	....	17	....	160
Wisconsin	....	46	....	51	....	2,500
Iowa	....	32	....	36	....	1,488
Minnesota	....	22	....	25	....	597
California	....	13	....	20	....	733

* Now in two Dioceses.

This is surely a wonderful exhibition of growth. And when we bear in mind the character of the growth itself, that the Church relies not at all on temporary excitements, that she rarely or never loses what she once gains, we may doubt whether since Apostolic times there is a parallel record in history. Well may we exclaim, "What hath God wrought!" We leave our readers to examine the figures for themselves. The number of our Dioceses has increased from *twenty-two* to *thirty-three*. The number of our Bishops, including Missionary, has increased from *sixteen* to *forty-three*. The number of our Clergy, as reported, has risen from 763 to 2,065. The number of our Parishes has swelled from 590 (as reported in twelve Dio-

ceses) to 2,120, as reported in 33 Dioceses. The number of Communicants has increased from 36,416 (in nineteen Dioceses) to 139,611 in 33 Dioceses.

In respect to the strictly Missionary Work of the Church, as, previous to 1835, there was a lack of order, system and unity, it is impossible to institute any comparison which will show so exactly in figures the gain that has been made. The progress, however, has not been less decided. At that period, 1835, there were about thirty Domestic Missionaries scattered here and there over the country, laboring diligently and successfully. The latest reports give the number of 130 Missionaries, occupying more than 150 stations in the Domestic Missionary field. The growth of the Church in this country in the next ten years, judging from present appearances, is to be without a parallel since the Apostolic age.

In the Foreign Department, the comparison is equally marked and cheering. In 1835, there was indeed a Mission School in Greece, and some steps had been taken, looking towards Missionary operations in Africa and China; and this was all. Now, in 1860, there are, at our various Foreign Mission Stations, in Africa, China, Japan, Greece, and South America, *seventy-two* persons laboring as Missionaries and Teachers; and in Africa, alone, there are already *three hundred and twenty-three* Foreign, Colonist, and Native Communicants.

As to Contributions, the whole amount contributed for Foreign and Domestic Missions, in 1835, was $33,879 75. The amount contributed to Foreign and Domestic Missions, in 1859, was $172,862 80. The whole amount contributed to both Departments, *in the thirty-four months* previous to the General Convention of 1835, was $72,717 13. The whole amount contributed to Foreign and Domestic Missions, *in the thirty-six months* previous to the Convention of 1859, was $408,156 39. The entire amount of money poured into our Diocesan Treasuries, and given to other Church objects, in the three years previous to the Convention of 1859, is reported as being $3,978,868 46, or almost *four millions* of dollars. There is nothing to boast of in all this, but as it is sometimes

said that Churchmen are destitute of piety and liberality, it may be well enough to note, that at least no denomination of Christians gives its money more freely, and we think we may say more unostentatiously.

The statements which we have now given of Church growth since 1835, though incomplete, may be left to tell their own story. We shall not dwell upon them. The Missionary System of the Church then adopted, Scriptural and Primitive as we have shown it to be, has not been a failure; it has proved a wonderful, glorious success; such as ought to overwhelm us with gratitude to God, and to humble us into the very dust for our faithlessness, our indifference and our worldliness. Thank God, the Missionary Work has taken deep root in the heart of the Church. Myriads of the faithful, in their daily prayers, plead for it before One, Whose ear is always open, and to Whom the Church is not less dear now than at that hour when He poured out His own precious blood to purchase it. The wealth, the gold and the silver are His, and they will, hereafter, be more cheerfully and more freely offered in this noblest, greatest of all causes, the Missionary Work of the Church of Christ. In such a work, and at such a day as this, let us forget ourselves, and forget the differences, if there be such differences, between us and those who profess the same Faith, who worship at the same Altar, who partake of the same Sacramental Body and Blood of the same Blessed LORD and SAVIOUR. And if, in our worldly hearts, the question ever comes up, "Who shall be greatest?" let us remember, that in this spiritual, yet eternal and glorious Kingdom, it is only those who have the temper of a little child, who are willing to be least of all, and servants of all, who will at last be found worthy to be nearest to HIM, Who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Among those, who are in sympathy with this new movement, are men, we doubt not, of the purest motives, and truest love to the Church of which they are members. There are also, we know, many who are utterly opposed to that movement, who yet feel, and feel deeply, that something is wanting to make the Missionary work, and indeed the whole Church

work, in all its varied departments, more thoroughly effective. To these, in conclusion, we have a word to say. What is it that is now needed? It is a great question; it is the problem of the age. It is not, as Infidels tell us, a New Gospel and a New Church. It is not a New Missionary System. It is something different, in its very nature, from all this. It is something within us, not without us. It is, in one word, and only one word, FAITH. Faith which makes reality of things not seen, and which works by love. Faith, as to the spiritual needs of men. Faith in JESUS CHRIST and in HIM alone as "the Desire of all nations."* Faith in JESUS CHRIST as still in the Church, and with the Church. Faith in the Personality and Omnipresence, and Almighty Power of the HOLY GHOST. Faith in the instrumentalities which CHRIST appointed, and which the HOLY GHOST will bless, if rightly used. This is that mighty principle according to whose measure is promised the degree of our success.† In its place we see an irregular, abnormal, fitful zeal, a boastful humanitarianism, an intense overshadowing, blighting worldliness; a grasping, almost supreme, if it be not supreme selfishness. Supplant all this with that which we have named, and the work is done. There are men enough in the Church to-day, young men, to traverse the length and breadth of the land as Missionaries of the Cross in the next twenty-five years; and there is wealth enough in the Church to support them. We know of but one real remedy for the evil. It is in lighting anew the old beacon fires, in bearing aloft the old standard, incribed with the old watch-word of reproach and of victory, "CHRIST AND THE CHURCH." It is in coming back to primitive discipline.‡ It is in individual, entire, self consecration. It is in earnest, persistent, effectual prayer. Let devout hearts, to whom our pages come, carry the Missionary Work to their Altars, in the closet, in the family, the Church. Let them, in their Offerings, remember it in a manner worthy of the immortal Crown that they

---

* Hag. ii. 7. † Matt. ix. 29. xvii. 20.

‡ See that cockney priest with his little dainty jewelled finger make the *Sign of the Cross!* on the forehead of the infantile representative of a codfish aristocracy. Pshaw!

hope for. In their Wills let them name it in a way to show that their Faith is strong enough to lighten up the dark valley.

For ourselves, we confess we do not expect to see the Church coming up to her true position in this country, reaching and moulding the masses of the people, until there shall be in her a full recognition of what are in reality her true Catholic principles. The "Memorial Movement," pointed, though indistinctly, to a great truth. Catholicity does not mean Mediævalism, nor Rationalism. The Church is not ready for such a step yet; but multitudes of hearts are preparing and waiting for it. How that movement is to be brought about we shall endeavor to show hereafter; and to labor for it we are pledged by the firmest convictions of our judgment and our faith. The Gospel will become a living power. The Three Orders of the Ministry will be something else than a name. Baptism into Christ will be more than a decent festive ceremony. The Laymen and Laywomen of the Church will feel that they have a work, and a great work to do. Life, free life, gushing life, is what the Church wants—yet life in Form. That Form will then seem to be something else than an angular, soulless thing, clothed only with an artificial, painted, aesthetic beauty. It will stand forth before the world, full of sympathy for sinning, suffering Humanity. Above all, it will be seen and felt, that the Love of God, yea, that Christ Himself is in it, as its Life, and power, and beauty, and glory; that it is God's own appointed plan for bringing back to Himself the world from the dominion of Satan, sin and death.

Before closing, we have another suggestion to make; and we do not offer it without a knowledge of a widely prevailing Church sentiment on the subject. It refers to the organization of the Missionary Board, and the construction of the two Committees, Foreign and Domestic. In respect to the Board, the plan recently adopted to enlarge its numbers so that it shall represent every portion of the Church, was admirable in its design. And yet every one sees at a glance that the appointment of such a Board by nomination merely, on the present plan, can hardly fail to give a list of men who do not, in any Diocese, fairly represent the true Missionary life and zeal of the Church; and in some Dioceses who scarcely repre-

it at all. There are scores, if not hundreds, of men in the rch, men of true and warm hearts, men who control great chial capabilities, who yet, on the present plan, have no e in that Board and never will have. Our suggestion is, in addition to the Members of the Board appointed by Convention, the Convention direct that every Clergyman, se parish contributes annually, and so long as it so contrib- a certain definite amount to the Missionary Treasury, say hundred dollars, shall be a Member of the Board. It is t in principle. It is the only true principle of representa-, because it represents what all see to be the great necessity he times, a living, loyal, working Church. One of the its gained by such a change would be, that, while we thus serve fully the great principle of Church loyalty and re- nsibility, we at the same time give free scope to that indi- ality, that freedom and spontaneity of feeling and action, ch our whole Church System, in distinction from Romish ile ecclesiasticism, every where recognizes. We beg the ler to look carefully over the present Board of Missions, ge as it is, it is not too large,—the larger, the better if its nbers have the right spirit,) compare that list with the unt of contributions from their several parishes, and see if suggestion is not a sensible and important one.

In precisely the same principle, we suggest a different con- ction of both the Committees, Foreign and Domestic. In- d of selecting them from the Clergy and Laymen of any city, let every important portion of the country be repre- ed in them. Let Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and if ticable, Charleston and New Orleans, have a place there. men be appointed because they are earnest men, live men, thoroughly with the Church, heart and hand, in this great- noblest of all designs. We affirm confidently, that it will be ng time before these great centres of Church influence and er are found doing their whole duty, unless this principle epresentation is fairly carried out. The Church in every t has a right to active management in a cause for which it esponsible, and in whose behalf its money is so perpetually l emphatically invoked. This principle of representation is

stamped indelibly on every fibre of the American character; it enters into the frame work of all our Institutions. It is, withal, thoroughly Scriptural and primitive. If the Church is a body, we may as well despair of its normal, vigorous, free action, so long as its working limbs and members are all on one side. We shall not anticipate objections to this suggestion. The Meetings of the Committees may be held quarterly, and, our word for it, these gentlemen will attend. If more frequent consultations are called for, the present local Committee at New York may be entrusted with the less important details. This principle has already been partially adopted; all that is necessary is its fair and full application.

In our argument in this Article for Church Missions, *distinctively as such*, we have confined ourselves almost entirely to the nature and design of the Church. To some minds another argument still more effective might be drawn, from the appalling spiritual destitution of our country; from the wonderful facilities now opening before the Church for prosecuting the work of Missions; from the boldness, and yet the new phases, in which Modern Infidelity is exhibiting itself; from the unprecedented activity and the keen foresight of the Romish Church in erecting its altars in this our New Republic: and last, but not least, from the dangers which now threaten our own Church *from within*, as "the Faith once delivered" is being undermined by a new School of so-called philosophers; men holding positions of influence in the English Church, and not without their representatives among ourselves; men who destroy the power of Faith by upturning its foundations; men who substitute for the Supernaturalism of the Gospel, in all its divine manifestations, the "guesses," and conceits, and self-will of a thoroughly infidel Rationalism. In such perilous times as these, when such momentous interests are at stake, we put the question soberly, in the fear of God and love of Christ, is it wise for a Communion holding such a position, and numerically so small as ours, to rend the seamless garment? to divide and distract our Dioceses, parishes and brethren? to waste our strength in internecine fratricidal warfare? and all on such an issue as is now brought before our own branch of the One Church of Christ? To that question, with the great mass of Churchmen, we know there will be but one answer.

Art. IV.—TWO LETTERS TO MONSEIGNEUR PARISIS, BISHOP OF ARRAS.

Histoire du Bienheureux Pierre Claver, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Par J. M. S. Daurignac. Deuxième Edition. Lyons: 1855. 2 vols., 12mo.

II.

My Lord,—We are constantly told that England owes the first reception of the Gospel to the praiseworthy and pious efforts of St. Gregory the Great. It is true, that this good Bishop, who presided over the Roman Patriarchate, and who sent a missionary to the Saxons, in England, in the year 596, may be regarded as a chief instrument of their conversion; but, this was no more the first evangelization of Britain, than the conversion of Constantine was the first evangelizing of Rome. Augustine, his chief missionary, found that an Apostolic Church had long existed among the aboriginal Britons, if, indeed, it were not one of the oldest Churches in Christendom. He found it flourishing under its proper Primate, the Bishop of Caer-Leon, and enjoying the privileges of independence, guaranteed by the Œcumenical Canons to all Churches similarly situated. Their Bishops had assisted at the Council of Arles, in the year 314; their Catholicity had been fully recognized, and they had never been subjected to any foreign jurisdiction whatever.

Nor was it to what we now know as the Papal jurisdiction, that Augustine invited them to submit themselves. St. Gregory was no Pope, although, in his day, all Bishops were called by the title of Papa. The utmost that St. Gregory ventured to assert, was the presidency of the West, and this was far more than the Canons allowed him to claim, as simple Patriarch of Rome, with the Primacy attached to the Imperial City. But, even to this the British Christians resolutely refused to surrender their ancient liberties, and Gregory himself was obliged

to deal most respectfully with them, as a Church entitled to preserve its primitive rights and usages. I do not propose to repeat to your Lordship the history of those successive changes, by which the British Christians were in time forced to succumb; but I beg to remind you, that, though they finally became one Church with their Saxon brethren, they bore to the Saxon Church itself a dowry of primitive piety and independence, which the Anglo-Saxon Church, in turn, transmitted to the Norman Episcopate, and so preserved in the great Church, which was the product of all these elements. The Church of England is to be recognized, therefore, in the earliest Christianity of the Island, as really as the man exists in the embryo; and its aboriginal character as *autocephalous*, was long afterwards acknowledged, even by a Pope, when Urban II. saluted St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, as his *confrère*, calling him *Alterius Orbis Papa*. This happened many years after the Norman Conquest, and Anselm himself was an Italian, whose habits of thought concerning the Papacy were not those of the English people, even at this late period. King Henry I., who had learned from William the Conqueror to invest himself with some of the Ecclesiastical rights of the Island, quarrelled with him on account of his foreign subserviency; and even then, at the close of the eleventh century, the English Sovereign showed that he understood his position, and went so far as to threaten that repudiation of the Papal usurpation, which was never consummated, until another Henry re-asserted the ancient claim, in 1534.

It is well, therefore, that the B. Peter Claver, in his imaginary conversation with the English Bishop, is not represented as ignorant of the existence of the primitive British Church, though he strangely misrepresents its history, and falls into an error respecting the name of an ancient Christian King, of whom he speaks. "St. Lucien, king of Great Britain, and model of all truly Christian Sovereigns," says the B. Peter to his Episcopal interlocutor, "sent presents every year to the Holy See, such as were worthy of a king, as a tribute of gratitude, and as a mark of his attachment to the Church. Ever since the reign of this prince, all your sovereigns have copied

is example, and practised his piety, until the time of the unappy Henry VIII."

Such being the ecclesiastical history of England, according o the book which you commend to your Diocese, let us inquire s to the real history. The true name of the king here inended, was Lucius, the chief of a very petty portion of the sland, which, in modern times, is called Great Britain. Of is story, the greater part is regarded by our best writers as abulous, though, perhaps, with too great a degree of incredulity. Lingard, the Roman Catholic historian, contents himself ith the bare assertion, that such a person really lived.* His orrespondence with Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, has been lmost universally given up as a mere romance, though I see o reason for considering it wholly without foundation. I am isposed to admit it as genuine, for the sake of argument; for o Anglican has any reason to wish it otherwise. But what as the nature of his correspondence with the good Bishop, ho presided over the See, which was yet the capital of a hea-hen Empire? He simply asked the Bishop's assistance in he work of civilizing his people, to obtain for him a copy f the Laws of the Romans! On the other hand, the Bishop rites to him in a strain of unaffected humility, and with no race either of Pontifical arrogance, or of that simulated lowiness, which, in after times, was the cloak of the most greedy mbition, among his successors. His alleged letter† is not nworthy of a primitive Bishop, such as were the earlier occuants of the Roman See. "You have asked us," says he, "to opy for you the Imperial Laws of Rome. * * * According to the royal prophet, you are, in your own realm, the vicegerent of God. * * * May the Almighty, of Whom, in our estate, you are the representative, grant you the grace so o reign over Britain, that, hereafter, you may reign eternally ith Him."

Such being the facts, I return to the consideration of Peter Claver's version of them, in which there are, at least, two very rave mistakes. He insinuates that the tribute of *Peter-pence*

* Lingard, Vol. I., p. 31.

† See Collier, Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I., p. 33.

began with Lucius, as an annual act of homage; whereas, it originated in certain voluntary donations, at a much later period. It still existed as a mere donative, at the time of the Norman Invasion. When Hildebrand undertook to drive William the Conqueror into making it an act of homage to the Court of Rome, he received an answer based upon the ancient usages of the realm. "I do not find," said William, "that any one of my predecessors has ever done such a thing, in favour of your predecessors."

That no such tribute was sent to Rome, in the ages preceding Gregory the Great, is patent from the very story of the mission which he sent into Engiand. If the beautiful anecdote of his interview with the Saxon youth, in the slave-market, is to be received, it is evident that Gregory, at that period of his life, was ignorant of the existence of British Christians, and not very familiar with the geography and history of England itself. Augustine was afterwards sent by him, as to a land of heathens, and he seems to have been not a little surprised to find an ancient Church among the Western mountains of the Isle, and extending far northward, beyond the Solway and the Humber. In his endeavour to stretch the jurisdiction of the Patriarch over these primitive Christians, he encountered no less surprise on their part, for they had never heard of any such authority. "We have," said they, "our own Primate, the Bishop of Caer-leon-upon-Uske, who is our Father in God. As for him whom you call *Papa*, we know of no allegiance due from us to him, save that which we owe to every good Christian, according to his several function in the Church, and which consists in loving him with a charity the most entire."*

Such, then, was the Church of King Lucius; and, if he was "the model of all truly Christian kings," as the B. Peter Claver asserts, it is evident that it is no part of Christian royalty to be subject to the Pope. In fact, the letter of good Eleutherius would go far to justify the views of his own character entertained by Henry VIII. himself, who only claimed to be, what Eleutherius authorizes a British Sovereign to con-

* See Bishop Bull's Answer to Bossuet, p. 171. Edit. Baltimore, 1851.

der himself, "the Vice-gerent of God, in his own realm." I ave already alluded to the Œcumenical Canons, by which the risdiction of the Roman Patriarch is limited to his own *burbicarian* provinces, and by which England is placed in ie same independent position with respect to all external au- ority, which is enjoyed by Cyprus, respecting the Patriarch- e of Antioch. But, my Lord, on this point you are entitled hear a citation from a Roman Catholic writer. Let the enedictine Barnes* silence the Jesuit Claver! "The Island Britain," says he, "enjoyed originally the Cypriote privilege being entirely exempt from Patriarchal authority. It is ue that this privilege became subsequently obsolete, owing to ie strife and confusions of war; but when, in the time of enry VIII., it *was reclaimed*, with the consent of the whole alm, it seems just that they should preserve it, for peace' sake, id that, without any detriment to their Catholicity, or any peachment of schism."

You are well aware with what attachment to similar liberties, id with what jealousy of any infringement of them, your own allican Church has ever resisted the encroachments of Rome. he Gallican liberties, however, are not more ancient than the nglican liberties, nor have they been less honourably main- ined, from the beginning of intercourse with the Roman See. ven in the age of most humiliating submissions to usurped thority, the student of history is forced to recognize, in "the hurch of England," as it was even then entitled, an individu- ity, and a nationality, as real, though not as entire, as that hich it now enjoys. It is too true, that, under the Normans d Plantaganets, one after another of its most primitive and ost precious prerogatives was suffered to lapse to a foreign risdiction; but, not without vigorous remonstrances, and ble witnesses for the ancient order of things. As your own uis IX. laboured for the Gallican rights, and barred out the pe, whenever he could,—so in England, clergy and laity rove together against concessions, and never permitted them- lves to lose from their heart the profound resolve to get back

* Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, Section iii. Oxford, 1680.

what had been unjustly seized. Such was the spirit of the Constitutions of Clarendon and of Magna Charta, this latter instrument being formally the voice of the Church of England, by her own Primate, who maintained it against the anathema of the Pope. Had King John been other than the wretch he was, the six years of interdict, which had familiarized his people with some of the blessings of Papal subjugation, might easily have been extended, with their own concurrence; but the opportunity, then lost for a long time, was again afforded by the Court of Rome, under a reign less abject, and at a time when the Church knew how to seize its advantage. It was an evil day for the Pope, when he offended the *amour-propre* of a Tudor, whose very name reminded him of his ancient British ancestors, and who had the pluck to re-assert the rights which history assured him belonged to his crown. In so doing, he was content to claim nothing which had not always been recognized as the prerogative of Christian princes, in their own realms; nothing but what we have seen conceded in the Letter of Eleutherius, and asserted by Henry II. and his predecessors. Accordingly, the Church of England and the Parliament simply invoked the Sovereign to *resume* his royal prerogative, as *Episcopus ab extra;* a very dangerous prerogative in the view of Americans, but one conceded to the Emperors by the Christians of the fourth century, and, from them, transmitted to other sovereigns. Your own kings, my Lord, have always claimed, in the same manner, to be *Eveques-au-dehors*, and, as such, your predecessors have recognized them. Nothing more was done in England, when Henry VIII. began to act as head of the Church's temporalities, under old laws, which had long been violated, but which had never disappeared.

And here it is important to recall the fact that, if the British Church had yielded formally to the claim of Augustine, that claim was by no means such as was resisted under Henry VIII. Gregory was no Pope; he abhorred the very idea of an Œcumenical Episcopate, though he was a grasping Patriarch. It was only the patriarchal jurisdiction of Rome which was asserted by Augustine himself in founding the See of Canter-

ry. Now granting that the Church of England thus passed o "the Patriarchate of the West;" that Patriarchate had Canonical existence, and was itself a bold abuse. Nor did Church of England thus forfeit her right to return to her erior state, which was *her only Canonical position.* And en the Bishop of Rome himself destroyed this Western triarchate, and built up a new Canon-Law on the basis of forged Decretals, it must be evident that all claims founded previous concessions to a mere Patriarch, were *ipso facto* nihilated. A *quasi* Canonical subordination to the Western triarchate was one thing; subjection to the supremacy of a ntiff was quite another; especially when the assertion of h a supremacy outraged the precepts of Holy Scripture, traditions of the Fathers, the decisions of Catholic Coun-, and the sanctities of the individual conscience.

Nicolas I. is a name which stands out in Church History, as rking an age which had lost the free spirit of the Œcumeni- Councils. Thereafter Western Europe becomes Papal, and Churches of England and of France slowly sink into their ters, and suffer themselves to be despoiled. The gross fraud the Decretals riveted their chains, and became in fact the ndation-stone of the Mediaeval System of Law in the stern Churches. The old Catholic system was thus rendered ctically obsolete in the West; but *morally*, there can be no stion that it was truly Catholic to labour for its revival, and resist the power which had dislodged it. If, as Bossuet nes, it is schism to resist the Bishop of Rome enforcing holic Law, it is the very reverse of schism, according to the ie authority, to enforce the Catholic Law against a Pope violates it. From the age of Nicolas I. the Catholic spirit omes identical with the spirit of resistance to the Papacy. nceforth, if not before, any schism which resulted from such a it was an evil for which the Pope must answer. On this point te a Frenchman, and a member of the Gallican Church. mbition and worldly policy," says M. Dupin, "gave birth he Decretals; ignorance and credulity caused them to be redited. * * To demonstrate their fraudulent character a task superior to the intelligence and the critical powers

of the Seventeenth century; and even since the errour has been acknowledged, manifold usages to which the fraud gave rise have nevertheless maintained their place: long possession has enabled them to prevail." This is true, but it fails to tell the whole story. If the Decretals are false, as you, my Lord, must pronounce them to be, down comes the whole fabric of the Papacy, Mediaeval Law, and everything else that dates from the division of East and West. Away goes the Papal Supremacy like a whiff of smoke. The law of antiquity re-asserts itself. There is nothing but "long possession" which can be pleaded; and it wants but a few bayonets out of the way to serve an effectual writ of ejectment against that.

The Church of England, my Lord, was originally, as we have seen, Catholic and Apostolic, but not Roman. Under the Tudors she was enabled to re-assert her original character. Add the three hundred years of her latter independence to the six hundred of her primitive freedom, and you will see that she has existed as many years independently, as she endured in subjection. But from these, subtract two hundred years, during which her subjection was far from servile, and at least one hundred, during which she was struggling to be free again, and you will see that six hundred years at worst is the period of her bondage to the abuses of the Decretals. When these abuses took the form of a new Gospel, and of an organized schism, at the Council of Trent, the Church of England was happily already in full possession of her liberties. She had been a part of Latin Christendom, but she was never part of "the Roman Catholic Church." God had revived, in her, the Church of the first centuries, at the very moment when Primitive Catholicity seemed about to expire. The Nicene Church survives in the Anglican. In looking unto her Gallican sister, who so nearly joined her in the sixteenth century, we feel that if the Gallicans have an apparent advantage in maintaining communion with a greater number of modern Christians, we have a real advantage in preserving our identity with the ancient Christians. Meantime it is not difficult to reconcile ourselves to our isolation, when we see what it has cost you to indulge Bossuet's dream of Unity. The purely theoretical

ome, to which he adhered, is widely different from the Rome hich she herself claims to be, and which she has made herself i return for his Gallicanism. We cannot amuse ourselves ith his infantile endearments, exclaiming, *Sancta Mater Roana*, but we are free from such maternal visitations as the oncordat of 1801; from a no less injurious series of *coups 'Eglise;* and, blessed be God, from this last intolerable pest, ie New Dogma of 1854!

The B. Peter Claver affirms that "Henry VIII. abandoned ie *ancient religion* of the realm, to establish therein a novel ne." We have seen, that (granting he did change his religion) e did precisely the reverse of what is thus asserted. In fact, e once more put into operation the ancient prerogatives of ing Lucius, and abolished the Papal abuse which was modern. ut alas! he had none of the true piety of Lucius, nor was is the happiness to restore the old religion of the realm, the eligion which Lucius professed. To do this, was the blessed rivilege of another Lucius, the good and pure Edward VI.; hile the vigorous maintenance and defence of this religion ell to the lot of the last Tudor, Queen Elizabeth. Such is he view of our affairs which we take ourselves. If we are nistaken in point of fact, let it be shown where.

Next, my Lord, let me beg you to observe the great misakes which exist in your Communion touching this matter of he Anglican Reformation. Your biographical friend attributes nost of them to the B. Peter Claver, and so aids in giving hem a fresh circulation. It is insinuated, for example, that ur Reformation was identical with that of Luther, and that re derive our principles from him. This was the blunder or he artifice of Bossuet; but nothing save gross ignorance can ustify such an idea. A moment's reflection must convince any ell informed mind that the two reformations, Insular and ontinental, were wholly different in their origin, their proress and their issues. To this effect I quote one of your own riters.* "With Luther's revolution," says he, "the Anglican eformation has nothing in common, save a contemporaneous

* Revue des Deux Mondes, 1842.

outbreak. The surge of the Continent came thundering against its rocky isolation, but did not overflow it; and thence came *Dissent*, the veritable *Protestantism* of England." He means that Dissent is the Protestantism of Luther and Calvin, and that the Protestantism of the Church is no such thing, and this is the truth. What Bossuet means by "Protestantism," has no place in England except among the dissenters, who protest against the Church of England as violently as they do against the Pope. For three centuries the Anglican Church has defended Catholic truth against these on the one hand, and against Tridentine assaults on the other.

Further, the B. Peter Claver asserts another shameless calumny, when he says, that the origin of our reformation was nothing else than "the scandalous marriage which Henry VIII. contracted with Anne de Boleyn, after having repudiated his legitimate wife, contrary to all laws human and divine." In the exultation of his imaginary triumph, the good father ejaculates, "Such are the abominations in which your religion had its source: judge the effect by its cause!"

We shall see, very soon, that Henry VIII. lived and died professing, not the religion of the supposed "Anglican Bishop," but that of B. Peter Claver himself. There is no Anglican Bishop, nor is there a faithful Anglican layman now living, whom he would not have burned at the stake, as a heretic! We have no interest, therefore, in becoming his apologists. But what are the facts, my Lord? What is the history of this celebrated divorce? Mr. Welby Pugin is one of your co-religionists, and he is an Englishman. Let us take his testimony! "No confidence," says he, "is due to a writer who attributes the origin of the Church of England to the divorce of Henry VIII." So much respect does an honest Roman Catholic feel for any one who can mutilate history, as does the B. Peter Claver; or, more likely the biographer, whom your Lordship has endorsed! In short, this divorce, legitimate or not, has no more to do with our religion, than the divorce of Vashti from Ahasuerus. Both, in the providence of God, were made illustrative of His overruling power for good; and if blessings flowed from the latter upon the ancient Church of the He-

brews, I see no reason why we should regret that opportunities were offered, in connection with the former, for great blessings upon the Church of England.

Now for the facts: Father Claver calls Queen Katharine he "legitimate wife." Here is the very point at issue in this ivorce case. Was she really such? The weight of authority i against the B. Peter. Even Lingard,* who writes against [enry with all the violence of his prejudices as a Roman Ecesiastic, allows, nevertheless, that the validity of Katharine's arriage is a matter on which we may reasonably expect the ost judicious minds to differ. Unluckily for the good Jesuit, ope Clement VII. was, on this point, of the same opinion ith Lingard: for the latter testifies that, after reading a letr from Cardinal Wolsey, this Pope believed, or, at any rate, *rofessed to believe*†, that Anne Boleyn was a lady of unpotted character, and that the conduct of Henry was influced only by sincere and conscientious scruples. But further, e same pontiff gave Cardinal Wolsey authority, not only to xamine the legitimacy of the Queen's marriage, but *also to nnul it*, if he should arrive at a conclusion unfavorable to it.

Whence arose these scruples which a Pope regarded as sinere and conscientious? The B. Peter adopts the popular ike that they were first heard of, after the appearance of nne Boleyn before the eyes of her sovereign. He forgets that ey were seriously entertained and expressed at the very moent of Katharine's marriage, and had never been wholly set at st. And has your Lordship forgotten the passage in French istory, which gave Henry just cause for alarm lest his issue y Katharine should be pronounced illegitimate, after his own eath, and so his crown should pass to other than his own offpring? Let me remind you, that, in the case of a proposed marage between the daughter of Katharine and the Duke of Orans, the French ambassador recorded his remonstrance, on the round that she was illegitimate, and unworthy to become the pouse of a French Prince. This happened in the year 1527, and

* Vol. IV., p. 219.

† This insinuation of Papal insincerity is Lingard's, not mine. See ibid., p. 60.

was the event in which the question of the divorce took its rise, as well it might be, in view of the fact that a similar objection had previously proceeded from the Court of Spain. And who was the ambassador that thus stirred a matter, which was not destined to rest till the Papacy had reeled under the shock? Who was the first mover in the repudiation of Katharine, so offensive to the pious Jesuit Claver? It was a prelate of the Papal communion: for this ambassador was a French Ecclesiastic of high rank, Gabriel de Grammont, Bishop of Tarbes.* You, my Lord, as belonging to the same episcopal household, may, very likely, be of the same opinion with your venerable *confrère:* and, in that case, you will admit that, instead of being *repudiated,* "contrary to all laws human and divine," it was only in contempt of such laws that she was ever *married* to Henry. Yet a Pope permitted it.

Bossuet gores the Lutherans with both horns, and very justly, because of the vile divorce which Luther sanctioned in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse. Though I do not undertake the cause of Luther, who has his own followers to say what they may for him, I shall prove incidentally, that two Popes were quite as disgracefully committed in this affair of Henry. But, says Peter Claver: "Henry could only sustain his new crimes, by the aid of a new religion." Is this true? Even admitting that the divorce was a crime, and not a religious duty, the "abominations," of which the Jesuit complains, were all consummated while Henry was in full communion with the Pope, and by the aid and advice of the Papal clergy, if not of the Pope himself! The Pope was, indeed, unwilling to grant the divorce; not that he scrupled anything about the divine law, but because he was afraid to offend the Emperor, Charles V., Katharine's nephew and his own master. But he was anxious to gratify Henry, also; and so did not hesitate to offer him a compromise which was, indeed, "in contempt of all laws, human and divine." He gave Henry to understand that he might proceed to a new marriage, without awaiting any decision of the matter, and actually granted him a dispensation to marry

* Hume, Vol. III., p. 63, edition 1850.

y other lady, even within the first degree of affinity.* This, rtainly, was an accommodating pontiff, and Luther was not ore polite to the Landgrave of Hesse; while if Clement really lieved Katharine the lawful wife of Henry, it is hardly possie to speak too severely of his iniquity, in thus abandoning to trage a virtuous and afflicted lady. Henry was a tyrant, t even he revolted from the enormity which the Pope had been shameless as to suggest; and it must be owned that, bad as was, his character grows respectable in the contrast, if we mpare it with those of several contemporary Popes.† I must re borrow Peter Claver's words, to return his compliment: Such are the abominations of your religion: judge the cause the effect."

But, is there any reason to doubt that the marriage of Kathine was, indeed, a nullity from the beginning? Old Julius had sanctioned it without scruple, but great as was the defernce then paid to the Pope, the greatest of the schoolmen had onounced such marriages contrary to God's laws, and had ewhere laid it down that God's laws could not be dispensed th by the Pope, nor by any power less than God. We have n that even Clement VII. admitted the doubtfulness of ch a marriage; and it only remains to reply to the summary lgment of the B. Peter Claver, that the most learned theoians of Europe decided against it. Except in the Uniities of England, there was hardly any hesitation in coming this decision,‡ in which the Universities of Paris, Orleans, oulouse, Padua, Ferrara, and Bologna, with others, conrred. In the wonderful Providence of God, this examina- into the power of a Pope to dispense with the laws of d, led to unlooked for inquiries into the origin of the Papal thority itself, and so prepared the way for greater results n the marriage of Henry and Anne Boleyn.

It is not of much consequence to ask what may have been nry's real opinions in religion, but as Peter Claver repreits him to have been of our religion, it may as well be re-

---

* Lingard, Vol. IV., p. 51.

† Alexander VI., Julius III., &c.

‡ Hume, Vol. III., p. 154.

peated that such is not the case. "He died," says the B. Peter, "uttering the melancholy words *omnia perdidimus.*" But Lingard, while he informs us that the stories concerning his deathbed experiences are various, and that some have represented them as peaceable, adds his own opinion that nothing can be positively affirmed as to his dying reflections.* Father Claver knows so much better, however, that he even adds that "he sought to become reconciled to the Church, but had no opportunity afforded him." This cannot be true; for it is certain he imagined himself in full communion with the Church, to the last—not the Reformed Church, but the Latin Church in all the forms and dogmas it had accumulated up to that time: "except the supremacy"—says your Lordship? Your Lordship knows very well that, up to this day, the supremacy is no dogma of your religion, and it certainly was not then. I know the *Univers* will demur, but your Lordship will, doubtless, silence that voice, by the authority of Bossuet, who ought to know, and who sustains what I say. Henry died, therefore, professing all the articles of the Roman Faith, which it was possible for him to profess so long before the Tridentine Creed and this last dogma had been invented. He had always cruelly persecuted those who rejected Transubstantiation; and in his sick chamber he daily heard mass and received the Eucharist *in one kind only*, under the ministrations of his confessor the Bishop of Rochester. So says Lingard. Further, the King of France never doubted that he died, as good "a Catholic" as he was himself, and ordered masses to be said at Notre Dame for the repose of his soul. If such masses do any good, Peter Claver himself must allow that Henry is at rest, though, according to our religion, that is not, by any means, so clear a case.

The worthy Jesuit acknowledges Henry's former services to his religion, and especially his defence of "*the Primacy* of the See of St. Peter." It is important to observe that he never, for a moment, opposed himself to that *Primacy*, and that the Church of England, to this day, has never thought it a matter worth disputing. Happy will it be for Christendom, when the

* Lingard, Vol. IV., p. 213.

Bishop of Rome lowers his claims to the assertion of a mere Primacy among his brother Bishops. Until he does do so, upon him alone must weigh the sin of the schism which he has so long maintained between East and West, by asserting claims almost infinitely greater. One word of contrition and of conciliation on this point might reunite the Churches under the supremacy of Christ, and repair the existing woes and grievances which the usurpations of the Middle Ages have produced. Your Lordship knows well how different a thing is the Primacy, from the Supremacy, of Christendom. It is the latter which we repudiate, in rejecting the claims of the Pope; and, in so doing, we have the happiness, not only, to be supported by St. Louis and his cotemporaries, in your own country, but by the entire clergy of the Gallican Church, in the famous Declaration of 1682. If you Gallicans have not carried out the principles of that Declaration as logically as we Anglicans have done in completing the Reformation, I refer you to your favourite author, M. de Maistre, as my authority for saying, that we have been the more consistent. His sneers and sarcasms against the Church of France, for not daring to go on with its good work, are very instructive. Would that Bossuet might have anticipated them! Would that God had given him grace to follow out his convictions to what De Maistre allows must be their just conclusions! The History of France would have been very different, I am persuaded. There would have been no such Revolution as that of 1792, and Europe might even now have been united under a pure and primitive Christianity.

But the blunders of the good Peter Claver are too dear to him to be laid aside. He returns to the charge with the question: "What then induced Henry VIII. to abandon the religion of his ancestors, the ancient religion of his realm, and to establish a new one?" In this sentence we observe nearly as many mistakes as words. 1. The religion of his immediate ancestry had been that of Rome, and, as we have shown, he never abandoned it. 2. But the ancient religion of the realm was a widely different affair, as we have shown in pursuing our inquiries respecting King Lucius. 3. What is meant by a new religion is, in fact, the re-establishing of the old one.

4. And finally, he had no hand in this happy restoration, but opposed it, in origin and progress, with all his might, and died with no idea that it was ever to be accomplished. Under his daughter Mary, the Pope had his way again, and England was an Aceldama, in which his soul delighted, till the accession of Queen Elizabeth confirmed the Reformation of Edward VI., and restored the Church to the enjoyment of its primitive *culte*—a word that better expresses the idea than the word *religion*, which our language forces us to employ. In my opinion, a new religion was formed for the rest of Europe at the Council of Trent; but even the author of your present creed, Pope Pius IV., paid such homage to the antiquity of ours, that he proposed to Queen Elizabeth his pontifical ratification of our Book of Common Prayer, provided she would only recognize his supremacy.* It was not till this insidious offer had been rejected, that even the Papists of England withdrew from communion with the National Church, the identity of which they and the Pope himself had acknowledged long enough to make it clear that our Reformation was, by no means, effected by the creation of a new Church.

Here let us pause a minute to consider the exact position of the Church of England, during the last years of Henry VIII. Apart from the fact, that the Council of Trent had never, as yet, been heard of (which should make the position of Henry much more innocent in your Lordship's eyes) I do not see that anything which he did amounted to a sum total more serious than were the reforms of Joseph II., in the Austrian Church, in 1782. What then has been the position of that Church down to the date of the last Concordat? The claims of the Pope upon it were such as he never held upon England, for it had subscribed to the Council of Trent. Was it then in schism? It is not for me to speak in such a matter; but in another instance, more important, I may speak less modestly, for I shall rely on the judgment of one whom you will not dispute—the Ultramontanist, Count Joseph de Maistre. Of the illustrious

* See *Pope Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer*, by R. C. Harrington, M. A., Chancellor of the Cathedral, at Exeter, 1856.

Church of France, of which your Lordship is a chief pastor, hat writer has said, without any qualification, that it stood in 682, just where the Church of England stood, when it recog-ised the temporal supremacy of Henry;* and he pronounces s position a state of schism, "differing from that of England, ıly because the one was not avowed, while the other was so; ıd because they refused in France to draw the conclusions of ıe principles which they had asserted." Now, if you would ıve your Diocese taught that the Church of England adopted ıew religion in 1534, as your author asserts, I trust you will t it also be known that the Church of France in 1682 did ıe very same thing. Perhaps, when your perilous state of hism is understood, (seeing "the Four Articles" are still in ce,) you may find it worth while to go on with those logical sequences to which the Count refers, which would be a ased use of logic for Europe and the world.

Now, as to the Royal Supremacy! It is greatly abused in ıgland; it has often been complained of by Anglicans; but exists in France in a form equally absolute, and Bossuet mself, who defended it, had to complain of it. What has ppened in France is what has happened in England;† "the ıgistrates do not understand the Liberties of the Church, as the Bishops." But let Lord Campbell and the Privy Council under as they may, justice is not changed by abuses of gov-ament; and facts remain on record showing that the Royal premacy, which the Church of England recognizes, is none ıer than what the Church of France recognizes, none other an the Primitive Church accorded to the Emperors; and none ıer than was conceded to them by the ancient Bishops of me themselves. In proof of this, I cite from a French iter the following candid testimony:‡ "The Church of ıgland," says he, "has but rendered to Cæsar the things that Cæsar's; the same authority as that possessed by the ıman Emperor in the days of Gregory I.; the same, in effect, *the Gallican Church has so often claimed for her own Sov-*

* *Eglise Gallicane*, p. 326. † *Ibid.*, pp. 314, 339.
‡ *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1842.

ereigns, since the epoch of St. Louis." How silly the attempt to fasten upon us the charge of having placed the Church in a novel relation to the State, when we find the same state of things with you; and when St. Gregory himself, and all his predecessors after Constantine's day, submitted to similar relations with the Empire! It is often said that Henry's Supremacy was put in the place of the Pope's, and so it was, by a mere act of restitution: but the Pope's Supremacy was a purely temporal one. I have proved that his spiritual *Supremacy* was never acknowledged in England, nor in France; and that he himself has never dared to make it a dogma of your religion. The title *Supremum Caput* was accorded to Henry with the pointed reservation—"so far as the Laws of Christ permit:" but since the Church has been a reformed one, that title, enjoyed by the Romish Henry and his daughter Mary, has never been accorded to any Sovereign. Elizabeth could not endure* it, affirming it to be "a title due to Christ only, and unfit for any human being." It is not so esteemed in your Communion, my Lord, but such has been the opinion of the Church of England ever since it became free.

The tyrant Henry VIII. sustained his Regale by barbarous executions, and the Church of England is constantly credited with these enormities by your writers. But the eminent authority, whom I have already invoked, Mr. Welby Pugin, although a Roman Catholic, has fairly shown that these atrocities can, by no just process, be charged on the Anglican Reformation, because, he argues, no such Reformation as yet existed. According to this candid writer, this *Regale*, whatever we may think of its *Supremum Caput* and all that, was conceded to Henry by a Romanist Convocation and Parliament. Good Cardinal Fisher opposed it, and suffered for his firmness, but not at the hands of reformed Anglicans. "How do modern Catholics ignorantly charge the death of this great and good man on the Protestant system, which was not even broached at the time!" So says Pugin,† and he adds, "His

* See Jewel to Bullinger, May 22, 1859. Collier.

† An *Earnest Address*, &c. London, Dolman. 1851.

ers were Catholics, his judges were Catholics, his jury Catholics, his executioner was a Catholic, and the bells ringing for High Mass in the steeples of St. Paul's, as he ded the scaffold."

verting to our friend, the B. Peter Claver, we find him iming—"What! can a religion introduced by the sanc- f a Lucius be the false one, and that the true, which is ed upon the disorders of a Henry?" A question this, ı it gives me pleasure to answer, seeing that Henry was a Reformed Anglican, and that Lucius was never a sh one! The latter professed a form of religion, to which ıas graciously restored the Church of England; the for- ived and died in the profession of the abuses and super- ns which disfigured her during the Middle Ages, and ı had no existence previously. What! then we exclaim Father Claver, can it be that Lucius was the heretic, and r the Catholic? Can a religion which *produced* the dis- ı of the latter, be the religion of Eleutherius, and the rs of his day? It is to the sins of Julius II. and Cle- VII., that the worst sins of Henry may be traced.

ı it be, my Lord, that what is unpardonable sin on one side ıannel is a slight affair on the other? The anathemas of ope against the Church of England were just and neces- or they were not. If they were not just, you must allow ve are none the worse for being excommunicated by the

If they were, how happens it that you Gallicans are ıcommunicated also for what you did in 1682? Count de re* says you would have been placed in the same situation ich we are, if the Pope had not learned prudence, and d with more circumspection with regard to France." So ns there is no difference in the sight of God: our cases orally alike; but, on one side of the channel millions are ;ned to damnation, while on the other, as many millions ssured of salvation, simply because certain Popes were nt and circumspect, and others rash and impetuous! I 'our attention, my Lord, to this remarkable admission,

* *De l'Eglise Gallicane*, p. 341. Ed. 1853.

that ours is not the sin of the schism. But we may well bless God that the wrath of the Pope wrought our liberation, when we compare what has happened in England since 1682, with what France has suffered since that epoch, the crisis of her destiny. In like circumstances, it seems then, that France was retained in the Communion of Rome, and England was cast out. What have we lost? What has France gained? Let us compare our experiences and conditions.

On our part, for two centuries we have had peace, and progress, and vast expansion. Without any change we have preserved our entire system, our usages, our Liturgy, our Creeds. The Ultramontanist movement of the Pope in establishing a titular hierarchy in England, under Cardinal Wiseman, has only served to make manifest the real hold which the ancient Church possesses on the national heart. The political violences of 1831, and of the following year, were events that reacted in a freshening of the Church's power, and in a movement which, in five and twenty years, has wrought wonderfully towards the development of her inherent strength. The seminal forces of the great principles asserted by her in the seventeenth century, are now, for the first time, in full blossom, and promise the most abundant fruits. The extravagances of a few enthusiasts, who have thrown themselves into the embraces of the Ultramontanists, have served only to deepen the piety and perfect the patience of the genuine leaders of public thought, and to make more and more real that energy of benevolence which is stretching the English Episcopate throughout the world. Nor have they any lack of that note of suffering which generally accompanies the marks of Divine favor. They are sharply assailed by worldly men, by dissenters from the Church, by false brethren within, and by the insidious opposition of the Court of Rome; but, in spite of all, steadily and triumphantly, they are carrying forward the principle of primitive Catholicity, of which God, in fidelity to His promise, seems to have made the Anglican Church the special guardian and depositary. *Adhuc multiplicabuntur in senectâ uberi!* Surely this benediction is fulfilled in us; and blessed be God, there is that in the religion of the Anglicans, and in the spirit of their

hich begets a sound morality. We may point to it as
ishing the state of Society, wherever the language and
tutions of England have penetrated. In our temples,
t is offered to intelligence by puerile exhibitions, the
of tawdry shrines and images, and by ceremonies re-
th superstition. Our laity, and not merely our Clergy,
tified with the Church, have its interests at heart, and
nplary in their lives. Our most highly educated and
laymen are often the most distinguished for piety;
attribute to the spirit, with which our Bible and
ook have leavened the popular mind, no small propor-
he stability and prosperity which distinguish Anglican
ion.

re our Liturgy and Ceremonial deficient in dignity and
veness. They are invested with an air of "mild maj-
l sober pomp," inherited from the simplicity of the
e ages. A venerable friend,* since deceased, who offi-
r a long time for an English congregation at Sienna,
l me, that when his chapel was once visited, during
bration of the Eucharist, by an Italian Ecclesiastic, and
r of theology in the University, the latter confessed
est interest in what he had seen with his own eyes of
lican rite. He even confessed that he had borne a
f it to one of his superiors, in these words: "During
mnity, as I looked upon it, I felt myself carried back
ays of Constantine." Yet, it must be mentioned, that,
foreign chapels, our worship is shorn of much of that
eauty, derived from music and architecture, which so
exalts the celebration of Divine Service, in the parish
s and cathedrals of England.

uld hardly be fair for me, my Lord, to give, on the
nd, my own impressions of the actual condition of the
in France. I shall leave the contrast to be depicted
of your compatriots, who visited England in 1851.
ris," he says,† "Sunday is a day of pleasure, and, one
y, of fatigue; in London, it is a day of refreshment

* Rev. Dr. Jarvis, of Connecticut.
† *Trois à Londres*, par M. Emile Bouchaud. Paris, 1851.

and repose. I attended a service at Westminster Abbey, which corresponds with our High Mass. There reigned in the ancient temple a perfect silence, with absolute propriety, uninterrupted by bustling renters of chairs, or irreverent promenading. The crowd was closely packed, and the chanted prayers, mingling their accord with the swell of the organ, gave to that majestic fabric a character more impressively sacred. A multitude of men of high rank, and outnumbering, perhaps, the female worshippers, assisted at the service, attired in black, prayer-book in hand, and with irreproachable deportment, presenting to the lower classes an example truly noble. Is such our usual conduct in France? And are there not among us many Catholics, who are, to speak truth, only baptized Pagans? In our French Churches, of a Sunday, during the celebration of Divine Service, where are the leaders of our society—our magistrates, advocates, physicians, ministers of State, and officers of the army? Certainly, not in their place, at the head of the social system, which they direct, and to which they owe an example." Continuing his recital, the author portrays the Anglican preacher as a frigid orator, and as deficient in force of expression and gesture; but he adds, in language which shows his strong Romish bias,—"The Anglican Church, of *all heresies*, is that of which the ceremonial is most closely allied to Catholicism. Its recognized hierarchy, Episcopal and Archiepiscopal, has singularly mollified whatever of rigidity there is in the purely democratic theories of Protestantism. Much of the Catholic ceremonial has been retained. The organ accompanies the chant, and the same ornaments are in use —the altar, the mitre, the surplice, &c." Let us follow this candid and intelligent writer to the military chapel, at Chelsea, where he observed the troops at service, without arms, and assembled in perfect order. "The greater part of the soldiers," he testifies, "had their prayer-book in hand, and attentively followed the Service, while in a gallery, apart, were several officers also engaged in the worship. The Psalms were chanted by the *enfants de troupe*, transformed into choir boys. *In France, all this would simply raise a laugh.* The chants, or recitations, had a simple harmony. The Commandments of

God, and the Sunday Morning Hymn struck me as remarkable; and the *God Save the Queen*, with which the solemnities concluded, has a certain sovereign grandeur." Such, my Lord, are some of the effects of what even this author deems the *heresy* of England. Again, I ask, what have we lost by cherishing our Catholicity, without the help of Rome?

It is impossible for us not to reflect on our probable history, in case our fathers had failed to make good their return to Nicene Christianity. It was reverting to the Gihon of Nicæa, that saved them from the Dead Sea of Trent. It was with ill grace that even France consented to that nominal Council, which we have rejected as an illusory Convention, managed by Italians, and having for its aim the degradation of the Western Episcopate, and the perpetuation of Mediæval abuses, with their fruitful source, the forged Decretals. The spirit of this pseudo-Council found its meet apostles in the Jesuits; and Spain, which accepted it, with a fatal compliance, became Tridentine at the expense of its Catholicity, and now exists only as the victim of its suicidal folly. From her infatuated Court went forth the same malignant pestilence over her American Colonies. The magnificent Empire, which was overshadowed by her banners in the days of the B. Peter Claver, has long since disappeared, and nothing remains to attest her missionary exploits but those decrepid Mexican and South American Churches, which furnish a suggestive commentary on the character of a Council, that sent forth its emissaries, not to preach the Gospel, but to promulgate factitious dogmas and corrosive morals. The colonies of England exhibit a striking contrast, which well attests what civilizing forces abide in the Old Faith of Christendom, and what an ennobling spirit it infuses into the laws and manners of a people. Let me glance at the unquestioned facts concerning your own great and powerful France. After hesitation and contest, she yielded a qualified assent to the Trent Council. Her Catholicity remained in her "Gallicanism;" but, practically, her subscription to the new creed rendered her, day by day, more and more Tridentine. In spite of your immortal defenders of the seventeenth century, and notwithstanding their efforts to prop up and preserve a Catho-

licity which had been undermined by Ultramontanism—where is now the Church of Bossuet and of Pascal? We cherish the memory of these illustrious confessors as sacred. Their writings (though we must except their suicidal concessions to the Roman Pontiff) will live forevermore; but we search in vain for any permanent results of their lives and labours, in the Church of France. Their names are cast out and dishonoured. Their enemies are chief. Vain were their reservations, when once they had subscribed to the Pope. To yield to him the power of anathema over those whom God had not cursed, was to give him everything. Bossuet might qualify, and explain away, but the Gallicans endeavored to hold what was not tenable; and in acknowledging what the creed of Pius the Fourth exacts, they placed themselves in contradiction with their professed principles, with their desire to recognize the Holy Scriptures as alone infallible, and to limit their interpretation by the sovereign rule of Apostolic Antiquity. What could Rome give them but anathemas, in return for such submission? A suicide herself, she has been the shadow of death to her entire communion. Everywhere she has substituted decay for vitality. The *Univers* exults in the announcement, that "a grand work of *reconstruction* is going on, at this moment, in the communion of the Church." It means that the Episcopate is more and more reduced to nothing, and the Pope made the only power. One would say, the gates of hell had prevailed, if it is thus necessary to *reconstruct!* But, further, it is said, that even the Mediæval Canon Law is too free; a new Ecclesiastical System is to be imposed on France, which shall destroy every vestige of "Gallican Liberties." The genuine Catholics complain, that "the French Church is shaken to her foundations." They ask,* "What has become of her primitive Constitution? Whither have retreated all sound ideas of religious authority? Are the principles of an Evangelical morality acknowledged? Are they practised? Are not errors the most unpardonable grown common, alike in morals and *in faith!* Have they not choked with tares the good seed, which was sown by Christ and His Apostles? Is there any longer such

* *Observateur Catholique*, Vol. I., pp. 3, 52. Edit. Paris, 1855.

thing as ecclesiastical justice? What fixed principles are cognized in the relations of the Pope with other Bishops? What between Bishops and priests, or the faithful generally? s not the Catholic *culte* disfigured by intolerable superstitions?"

They say further, "We cannot but recognize, in the bosom the Catholic Church, the existence of a sect, which has for s purpose the substitution for God and for His Christ, of the irgin Mary. This sect, which saps the very corner-stone of hristianity, is already designated, and with justice, by the name *Marianism.* The Marianists attribute to Mary the salva-on and redemption of the world. According to them, nothing omes to mankind but by Mary. Mary, in their system, is a urth person to the Trinity; in power and splendor she sur-asses the Three, of whom, in fact, there is scarcely any men-on in the journals of this sect."

Here is a confession, indeed! And it must be added, that ie chief of this *sect* is the Pope himself, and that it is as ide-spread as the Roman Communion, which it has trans-rmed into a temple of Collyridians. Such are the fruits of *Ultramontanism*, a name which means the same as Tridentin-m; for, loth as the school of Bossuet may be to own it, Gal-canism is certainly not the system which was worked into a ew Creed, at the Council of Trent.

In conclusion, my Lord, if our religion is erroneous, is it not air that your co-religionists, in assailing it, should do justice o the Catholic and Apostolic principles which we profess, and onestly intend to maintain. We know very well that you con-ne this character to that which pertains to the Papal Com-munion; but, we do not see any proof that it should be so, nd your manner of action supposes, to begin with, the very natter which is in question. You can hardly deny that our rimary idea of Catholic verity accords entirely with that of ie venerable Churches of the Orient. Nor will you be able o convict us of any novelty, when we propose, as the base of atholic Unity, only these necessary things: 1. The Holy criptures. 2. The Apostolic Succession. 3. The Nicene reed. 4. The Definitions of the Four Œcumenical Councils. uch is the golden reed which suffices to measure the city hich lieth four-square, and the temple which is therein, and

those who worship in it! Now, all these things we have scrupulously preserved; and we maintain the principle, that every particular Church, which has done likewise, is legitimately Catholic. However debased, such a Church waits only for the breathing of the Spirit, to renew the vigor of her primitive life, by cleansing herself of impurities, and challenging her right to be acknowledged by other Catholic Churches, and to enjoy with them, unrestricted, Catholic Communion.

With this, entirely agrees the pattern set before us in the Apocalypse. You will remember, my Lord, the divisions and the dissensions of the Seven Churches, and how some of them had even corrupted the Faith. Yet each one of them was represented by its golden candlestick. Jesus Christ withdrew from none of them His presence; and their seven stars were all together held in His right hand. Until the absolute extinction of a Catholic Church, it would seem, therefore, that the Lord must be regarded as still cherishing its broken walls, and calling upon all His children to think upon her stones, and weep to see her in the dust. Such is the grand conservative principle, by virtue of which we may still hope to see the reunion of Christians, and the restoration of such a Catholicity as existed in the days of Constantine. No other restoration is to be imagined as possible. Whatever of prestige there has been attached to the See of Rome, the Pope has utterly destroyed, in making a new dogma. That act was one of self-destruction. He abdicated: he annihilated by it the last vestige of an Orthodox See. The Orientals have never acknowledged him in any other quality but that of a simple Patriarch, whose throne was not higher than that of Constantinople. For three hundred years, we Anglicans have consistently followed the Orientals; while your own Gallicans, shutting their eyes to the actual Popery, have acknowledged only a theoretical Pope —a Pope of history—such a Pope as has no existence, and can never exist again. There remain only the Ultramontanists to sustain the Tridentine Supremacy, and these reduce their Pope to a mere puppet, while they daily fabricate some religious novelty, in his name, which, far from conciliating the piety and the intelligence of mankind, only excites, more and more, the derisive scorn of the Universe. Besides, this Ultra-

ıtanism perishes daily, destroyed, like other absurdities, by very successes, which are momentary; and, in short, the ɔacy, in its decline, has no reserve of vital power, for its ival. It has been observed by Gallicans, that the *Papa* of Faithful is fast becoming the Grand Llama of the Tartars. The evil has its remedy; it was prescribed fourteen hundred rs ago, by Vincent of Lerins. "Quid si novella aliqua conio non jam portiunculum tantum, sed totam pariter Eccle- n commaculare conetur? Tunc item *Antiquitati* inhæreat holicus, quæ prorsus jam non potest ab ulla novitatis fraude uci."* Let us revert to the common maxims of Christen- a, to maxims which antedate the change of empires and of s; to the principles of Apostles, and of our Saviour Christ,— principles which He has preserved in the hearts of the an- ıt Churches, to spring forth, at last, in a restoration of mitive Catholicity.

Believe it, my Lord, it is but wronging their own souls, en your writers affect to ignore the true character of that erable Anglican Church, which no man can really despise. nsider her wide-spread Communion, her hundred Bishops, numerous Clergy, and her millions of Laity, comprising most intelligent classes of two great nations, and penetrating the Indies, to Australia, and to the shores of the continents l the islands which are washed by the Pacific Ocean. In ling with the Churchof France, such a Church must speak as ister, and exact the respect due to an equal. Against mere taries, you may gain fruitless triumphs; slaying the slain, Balmez has done, with others, who have opposed their mere ;ations, pretending to find nothing else in Anglicanism. But h pretences cannot succeed. We oppose to the Papacy ıething definite; not the spirit of revolt, but the Laws of d, and the Constitutions of Antiquity. That grand Canon ours, entirely,—"Id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, od ab omnibus creditum est." But, tried by this rule, what is is the Ninth, with his New Dogma? We reject that Dogma, l we claim to be Catholics because we reject it and others e it. For, listen again to the prophetic voice of Vincent,

* S. Vincent. Lirin. Common. iv., p. 8. Ed. 1847.

pleading our cause, and making our apology: "Ille est verus et germanus Catholicus qui quicquid universaliter antiquitus Ecclesiam Catholicam tenuisse cognoverit, *id solum* sibi tenendum credendumque decernit; *quicquid vero novum et inauditum subinduci senserit* id non ad religionem, sed ad tentationem potius intelligat pertinere." Such is the rule which forces us, at once, to put away from us the Creed of Pius IV., and the bull *Ineffabilis* of Pius IX. Long since did our fathers forewarn us that such fruits must follow; and truth is at last avenged by Rome herself, carrying out her claims to that extreme of consistency by which they are reduced to the absurd. And so, eyes are beginning to open! Thinking men throughout the world see the Papacy denuded, and no longer imagine it what it is not. They revert to its history and origin; they break the seals, which were closed at Trent upon the book of truth, and reopen the questions which were prematurely stifled three hundred years ago. "But Thou, O Lord, how long? Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Sion, for it is time that Thou have mercy upon her; yea, the set time is come."

May the Good Lord, before we die, permit us to see at least the beginning of that reunion, which all who love our Lord Jesus Christ, in sincerity, most fervently desire! By prayers and labours, may every one do his part! Be pleased, my Lord, to attribute to such charitable wishes, the liberty I have taken in addressing to your Lordship so long an apology for the position of an Anglican, and such a remonstrance against the injustice of a work which you have patronized. And allow me, in conclusion, to subscribe myself, my Lord,

Your Lordship's &c., &c., &c.,

A. C. C.

BALTIMORE, March 25, 1856.

NOTE.—The revision of the above Tract, by M. Godfray, extended only to its French diction and idioms. For the matter, the author only is responsible. All the publications of the Anglo-Continental Association may be found at D. Dana's, 381 Broadway. They are generally valuable Anglican treatises, in the divers languages of Europe, and might with great advantage be taken, or sent, abroad by every traveller who goes where those languages are spoken. This tract is published (as one letter), in the French language only, with the following title: "*Lettre a Monseigneur Parisis, Eveque d'Arras, sur les Erreurs Historiques qui existent dans la Communion Romaine à l' égard de l'Eglise Anglicane.*

ART. V.—DR. F. D. HUNTINGTON'S SERMONS AND THE TRINITY.

1.—*Christian Believing and Living.* Sermons by F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D., &c., &c.

2.—*The Christian Examiner.* March, 1860.

We have observed as a general rule, that, whenever an Orthodox Congregationalist in New England seeks the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, his former compeers are apt to say "they never did think he had much vital religion." So, too, whenever a Unitarian takes the same step, his former co-religionists are quite as apt to aver that "they never regarded his intellectual abilities as more than ordinary." Let a man have been never so distinguished in the one communion for piety, or in the other for *talent*, that fatal step bars all further claims in those directions. Spiritual or intellectual pride calmly and complacently pronounces the sentence of condemnation; a sentence, subject, happily, to the review of a tribunal, which scorns alike the Phariseeism of piety, and the poorer Phariseeism of intellect.

We had thought it possible that in Dr. Huntington's case, this rule might, for once, be suspended. Various antecedents had made it seem probable, but we were mistaken. The matter is treated cautiously, but the inevitable *caveat* is entered. Dr. Huntington has, indeed, we are told, "a special vocation for the preacher's office," and even a "genius for religion" (!); but "no capacity to argue questions of speculative theology"; he lacks "the scientific mind," "the intuitive as well as the dialectic faculty," "the penetration and critical tact," &c., &c.

Now it is not our business to defend either Dr. Huntington, or his modes of investigating and stating Christian Doctrine. But we are very strongly inclined to believe that in the matter of the Doctrine held, he will find the sympathy and support of the Church Catholic of Christ a very satisfactory substitute for the plaudits of that small but complacent clique, who

bask in those iridescent splendors with which liberal Christianity and Atlantic mists light up the city of the Three Mountains.

We do not, therefore, concern ourselves with the Reviewer's critique on Dr. Huntington's methods of argument or modes of statement. His own views of the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, as it was set forth at Nice and Constantinople, are what we have to deal with. And since he himself has adopted two lines of reasoning, one starting from a Scriptural basis, and another from the basis of Primitive Antiquity, we must follow him in both.

It is, indeed, no easy matter ever to follow a Unitarian writer in Theology. He believes, and he does not believe; he accepts, and he does not accept; now he argues that because an expression *may* mean some certain thing, therefore it *must* mean it; then he asserts that if it *must* mean this, still it *may* mean that; at one time he patronises the Church, and at another—remembering perhaps the address of the English Unitarians to the Ambassador from Morocco, in the reign of Charles II.,—he glorifies Islamism; now he denounces some particular heresy, and then he scouts the possibility of any heresy at all. Two facts illustrate all this for the system, and the case is the same with individuals. When, in 1785, the *Book of Common Prayer* was emasculated into the *Chapel Liturgy*, the *Gloria Patri* was every where omitted as unscriptural, if not idolatrous. In 1860, three quarters of a century only having elapsed, the Christian Examiner asserts that "most Unitarians could heartily join" in what in another place it calls that "reverent and dear ascription!" If this be a return to the Faith, God be praised for it! But what an immeasurable difference between 1785 and 1860!

Another matter deserves especial notice. We gladly miss, in the review before us, the old stock argument of Unitarianism, that no man is bound to believe what he cannot understand. Most of us can remember the time when that argument—so we call it by courtesy—always did duty in the fore-front. And it made the case fearfully hopeless. For, it was the declaration on the part of a finite being, that, in his belief concerning the

Infinite God, he would absolve himself from the operation of a law, which ruled his belief concerning himself and all created things. In himself, in his own existence and constitution, in all the physical world about him, subject as they were to the cognizance of his senses, and the direct application of his reason, he could believe, every day, ten thousand things which he did not understand. In the mighty GODHEAD, never subjected to the cognizance of his senses, far beyond the direct application of his reason, he would believe nothing that he did not understand! Fortunately he was inconsistent in applying his own darling principle. Had he not been, he must have been an Atheist. But had the pride of intellect a higher point than this? Surely, this was the region of perpetual congelation, where all vitality was checked, and men could neither believe nor tremble.

If this ground, therefore, is abandoned as untenable, a great advance has certainly been made. For then, the appeal, unembarrassed and unencumbered, will be to Holy Scripture. And if to this there might be added the testimony—we will not here say the judgment or the authority—but only the *testimony* of the Early Church, then the controversy might, at last, be terminated. Of this, however, there is at present, small hope. Mountain barriers of prejudice must be removed before the appeal to the witness of the Church can be even understood; and meantime multitudes are drifting towards that position in which Scripture is ruthlessly set aside, when it does not happen to agree with the "subjective convictions" of the individual. Still, it is worth something to have that old ground abandoned in the Unitarian Quarterly.

We turn to our Reviewer's own excogitations: and first, to the way in which he deals with the Holy Scriptures. One sentence states in brief his entire position. "It is somewhat unexpected to find ourselves, in the year of grace 1860, gravely reiterating what Trinitarian scholars of critical repute will concede, that the dogma of the Tripersonality is not the doctrine of the New Testament." We beg to assure our Reviewer, in passing, that it is quite as unexpected to many others as to himself, to find any body in this year of grace 1860

making *gravely* such an astounding statement. But, as we have said, this extract expresses his entire position. The doctrine of the Nicene, Constantinopolitan and Athanasian Symbols is not in the Scriptures. That is the thesis, and now for the proof.

Divested of its wrappings of words, and reduced to plain English, the proof alleged is, simply, that the identical statements of these Symbols, and their exact phraseology, are not found in the New Testament. Who ever supposed or asserted that they were? The argument, moreover, has not the merit even of originality. It is as old as the days of Athanasius, and more irrelevant than it is ancient. For the true question is simply this: What are the truths which Scripture sets forth in this matter, and how are they to be adjusted to each other? If, in adjusting them, some word is employed which is not found in Holy Writ, that mere fact constitutes no valid objection to the word, so long as it is an adequate, or a proximately adequate expression of a Scriptural idea. Neither "Trinity" nor "Transubstantiation," are words occurring in the Scriptures; that mere fact is no ground of objection to either. The proper enquiry is, do they express scriptural truth; and by the answer to that enquiry, the one stands and the other falls.

The true process, then, in the examination of the great Doctrine under consideration, is in some sort, an inductive one. To borrow a formula from scientific investigation, we must carefully, laboriously, earnestly collect all the phenomena which Scripture presents, and see to what result we come; how we can reconcile and harmonize them with each other. This is the only logical or safe process by which we can "search the Scriptures" to see if the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity is in them.

Of course, we do not, for a moment, intend to assert that all individuals are compelled to go through this process in its completeness before they can accept, or profess a belief in the Doctrine. The Apostolic preaching first, and the Creeds of the Church afterward, would present to them *some* Doctrine on this vital point—we put it in this general way for the sake of argument—and their searchings of the Scriptures, whether

ore or less perfectly carried out, would, necessarily, be a subquent thing. We are speaking, be it observed, of the scienic process—if the phrase may be allowed—of the Theologian, pealing, (aided as yet only by prayer for illumination, and *right reason*, and not yet seeking any help from the testiony of the Primitive Church,) to the Word of God.

Such an one, we say, is bound carefully to collect the phemena which Scripture reveals, and then see how, in what ay, and under what conditions, they are to be adjusted and armonized. This is a lengthened and slow process, for which ur Reviewer seems to entertain the same profound contempt at sciolists do for patient investigations in scientific phenoma. He cannot "be expected to retrace, in detail, the many mmonplaces of this debate." He has "neither the spirit or the space to lug forth and spread out the mouldy straw hich other generations have threshed so soundly." As all en, however, are not born in that "celestial flowery kingom" of intellect where our Reviewer's happy lot is cast, and are not gifted with those superhuman capacities for intuively reaching truth, they must be fain to content themselves ith considering and reconsidering the "commonplaces;" and e more vital the topic, the more careful, sober, reverent and iscriminating will their study be.

What then, are the truths, the phenomena, in this case, ached in Holy Scripture? We do not propose to classify roof texts. We shall simply state them as the great body of hristians in all times have received them, and indeed, as—one oint excepted—we suppose our Reviewer would accept them.

1. There is but one God.

2. To the Father are ascribed all the attributes of this odhead.

3. To the Son are ascribed the same attributes, e. g.: Eterity, Omniscience, &c.; and the same works and worship.

4. The same thing holds true of the Holy Ghost.

Up to this point, as we have intimated, we imagine our eviewer will go with us. For his objections do not seem to e against what he is pleased to call "a triad of Christian nctities," and he can worship the Son and Holy Ghost as

well as the Father, and that, without any intimation that he distinguishes between *Latria* and *Dulia*, offering the former to the Father only, and the latter to the Son and Holy Spirit.

But when we come to assert that,

5. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost, have each distinct personal characteristics and agencies attributed to them, then we suppose he will enter his denial, and take the field at once. Here, however, we shall not argue the point *in extenso*; what we are doing just now, is to state the phenomena which Catholic theologians find in the Sacred Scriptures. Special points can be defended, if at all, when they are denied.

Now, it *may* be asserted, in reference to these truths, that they cannot be harmonized and reconciled with each other. In that case, however, the Scriptures themselves are given up as hopelessly contradictory and discordant, and with such a method of disposing of the question, we are not, at present, concerned.

Suppose, on the other hand, we attempt to harmonize and adjust them. Then, in the outset, there is one plain principle that must be accepted and acted on. No view of the case can be admitted, which begins by ignoring or neglecting *any one* of the truths to be dealt with. They must *all* be provided for, or else nothing has been accomplished, and no result reached.

In what modes, then, has the adjustment been attempted? In four, and actually, in no more.

1. *Tritheism*, asserting three independent, self existent Deities, accepted the last four truths, but denied, or at least passed by, the first.

2. *Arianism* and *Macedonianism*,—we class them together because the method was in each the same—denying the proper Deity of the Son and Holy Ghost, acknowledged three of the truths revealed, but rejected the second and third. It is, however, worthy of note, that Arianism, with all its pretended zeal for the Divine Unity, did, by asserting the creation of the Son and then challenging for Him the worship of man, virtually and yet distinctly commit itself to Polytheism.

3. *Sabellianism*, asserting a mere variety of name, in which the one personality was, under one set of conditions, called the

her, under another the Son, and under another still, the y Ghost, accepted the first four truths, but denied the fifth. Ve have not taken into the account modern Socinianism, ch by a most ingenious pravity, has contrived to take up itself all these forms of error, the first only excepted, and dd some choice morsels of its own. It involves, however, ew principles.

ow, clearly, none of these modes of reconcilement and adment meet the case. They deny or else pass by, one or e of the revealed phenomena, and therefore they fail, and d self condemned.

. Not so the *Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity* as expressed he Nicene Symbol. That accepts and provides for all that has revealed. It denies nothing. It ignores nothing. It nonizes all. And therefore it is, logically, the only alterve—the premises being admitted, which here, we simply, as ave said, state without arguing—from rejecting the Holy ptures. And such, we verily believe, it will sooner or later ound.

t holds to the Unity of God; "I believe in ONE God." It esses the proper Divinity of the Father, "God the Father ighty;" of the Son, "One Lord, Jesus Christ, . . . being of substance with the Father;" and of the Holy Ghost, "the y Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life." It sets forth the inct personality of these three; of the Son, "begotten of Father, before all worlds, . . . God *of* God, Light *of* Light, y God *of* very God, Begotten not made;" and of the Holy st, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son." And es, in these two last extracts, what all deniers from Arius n have ever been clamoring for, *the words of Scripture.*

gain we say, we by no means assert that this inductive ess was to be gone through by every individual before could have the Doctrine brought to him. The Church all ag—this assertion will be considered almost immediately—ached and professed the Doctrine; and at the same time she er shrunk—the pure Church never has shrunk—from appeal- to the Scriptures, and bidding all her children to search them ether these things were so. And thus, while she avoided

the popish whirlpool of oral tradition, she did not dash herself upon the rock of a licentious individualism.

We turn now to our Reviewer's second line of argument, his ecclesiastical line, as it may be called. His position here is quite analogous to the one we have just been considering. It amounts to this; that the Doctrine of the Tripersonality was unknown to the ante-Nicene Church! That even Nice did not affirm the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost! And, in a word, that Nice, in 325, and Constantinople, in 381, developed and set forth an entirely new Doctrine of the Trinity! Our Reviewer, moreover, professes great reverence for the ante-Nicene Church, and does not object to what he terms "the Christian Doctrine embodied in the Trinity," but only to the "forced construction of that Doctrine" in the Creeds of Nice and Constantinople. This sudden reverence for the Primitive Church, reversing as it does all the ordinary traditions of the elder Unitarianism, is somewhat startling. We are glad, however, to recognize it as a hopeful sign.

We ask for proof of this strange assertion as to the Faith of the Early Church, and its entire difference from that professed at Nice, and as before, we find it in the allegation that the exact Nicene and Constantinopolitan phraseology is not found in the early writers. Now, even if we admitted this—and of course no scholar will admit it without many and important qualifications—the case would not be made out for our Reviewer. Does a new word of necessity imply a new idea, or a new doctrine? Does the addition of a term, and that term intended to meet what was believed, at least, to be an existing error, involve the assertion of something not believed, and indeed not known, before? Suppose a person reading the Apostle's Creed, "I believe in God," and then turning to the Nicene, "I believe in *one* God," should, thereupon, gravely argue, that, anterior to the Council of Nice, the Unity of God was not held as a fundamental of the Faith, and that the Council of Nice first affirmed it. It would be just as sensible, cogent, and conclusive a style of argument, as that which our Reviewer and his *confrères* are adopting.

But, it may be said, "Your illustration is not a fair one. On turning to the Doctors of the Early Church, we find them all

declaring their belief in the Unity of God. And the precise allegation which we make, is, that these same Doctors do not recognize, or assert any belief in the Trinity professed at Nice." Very well. This allegation, again, we deny just as precisely and distinctly as language will enable us to do it. And we invite our readers to consider the fact as to the ante-Nicene Fathers, and then to bear with us, while we say a few words as to what the Councils of Nice and Constantinople really did undertake to do, in the matter of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Correct views on these points are of vast importance, in more directions than one. They correct, as well Popish fallacies, as such crude speculations as these before us.

We ask attention, here, to some historical facts, which will show that our Reviewer's position as to the ante-Nicene Fathers is by no means new, and has been most thoroughly refuted. During the middle portions of the seventeenth century, various attacks were made on the Doctrine of the Trinity; some by Socinians, others by Arians, and one by a Papist. The Socinians, as they have generally done, confined themselves to the argument from the Scriptures, and gave little or no weight to the testimony of the Early Church. The Arians—like Courcelles [Curcellæus] for instance—endeavored to make much of the early Doctors, asserting that the Nicene Doctrine was unknown to them. Petavius [Petau] the Jesuit, made identically the same assertion, though with a different purpose. For, while the object of the Arians was to overthrow the Nicene Definitions which they rejected, that of Petavius was to exalt the authority of the Council that set forth the Definitions which he accepted, and thereby to advance the Romish view of a General Council, and so to sustain the claims of the Council of Trent. Our readers, however, will observe, that the positions of the Arians of the seventeenth century, of the Jesuit Doctor, and of the Unitarian Quarterly of 1860, concerning the ante-Nicene Doctors, are identical.

In answer to the erroneous speculations of his times, Bishop—then Doctor—Bull, published at Oxford, in 1685, his *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, in which these assertions were triumphantly disposed of. Now, it is not perhaps to be expected, that this work of a humble Bishop and Doctor of the

Church of England, can be known within that inner and serene circle of lofty intelligences in which our Reviewer is supposed to move. But it is none the less true that it, and his *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, published in 1694, have been acknowledged by Protestants and Papists alike, as the grand store-houses of information on this momentous topic. These historical facts we take to be of some value; and we need hardly add, that Bishop Bull is not demolished by the *Christian Examiner* of March, 1860.

And now, how is the question as to the ante-Nicene Doctors to be settled? Why in the very simplest way possible; a way, which, unless to a man obstinately bent on advocating a fallacy because he can defend himself in no other way, is as clear and satisfactory as a mathematical demonstration. The mere terms employed are not the only things to be considered. Far from it. We take the ideas which those terms express, and surely an ordinary intelligence can then decide whether the ante-Nicene Doctors set forth those ideas or not.

Let us take one term in illustration, the famous word *Omoousion*, in which was asserted the Consubstantiality of the Son. We are not writing a tractate in Doctrinal Theology, and cannot, therefore, give pages of extracts. But we challenge contradiction to the statement, that, beginning with Clement of Rome, and Ignatius, and coming down through Justin Martyr and the Apologists, through Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, the Dionysii, Gregory the Wonder Worker, the six Bishops of the Council of Antioch held against Paul of Samosata, there is a line of testimony to the universal belief in the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, that no hardihood of denial can overthrow, no ingenuity of a perverse sophistry can undermine. There it stands, the recorded Faith of Christendom, just as certain, just as sure, as the *e pur si muove* of Galileo.

We do not, of course, assert that there will all along be found the same exactness of statement, the same carefulness in terminology. Increased exactness and carefulness are just what we should expect, from the very conditions of the case. They grow naturally, and indeed necessarily, out of the progress of controversy. But he would be a scholar, so shallow

nd superficial as scarcely to deserve the name, who should istake a more logical statement or a more guarded defini- ion of an old belief, for the assertion of a doctrine, new and efore unheard of. We content ourselves with the instance lleged above, not because we might not say as much of all he rejected portions of the two Symbols, but simply because me and space are failing us, and pass on to our last topic.

Endless confusion has arisen in reference to the Definitions f Nice—we again, for the sake of clearness, take a single in- tance, though, as will readily be seen, the principles insisted on ave a wide application—from neglecting to consider a very mple preliminary question; *i. e.*, what did the Council un- ertake to do; under what circumstancees; and in what way?

A doctrine had been broached which, it was charged, was ew and erroneous, and the Council undertook to settle the ntroversy which had arisen. And how was it to be settled? Vhy, by affirming the old Faith, in a more logical way it ight be, in a more exact and guarded terminology, but still he *old Faith*. To *testify*, therefore, and not to *excogitate*, as the great work. Terms might be discussed and doubted f, but the Faith was witnessed to. Athanasius is surely a mpetent witness here, and he shows that this idea of the ouncil's work is no after-thought. For, in his Tractate *De ecretis*, &c., he says, speaking of the terms "of one sub- ance," and "consubstantial," "They [the Nicene Fathers] id not *excogitate* these words, as these [the Arians] object, ut *received* them from others more ancient than themselves." nd then he goes on to prove against the Arians of his day, hat Bishop Bull thirteen centuries later proved against Arian nd Jesuit, the antiquity of the Doctrine which this terminol- gy expresses.

And so, too, the Council of Constantinople, in its Synodal etter, says, that the Fathers there assembled "pronounced me short Definitions, *ratifying* the Faith of the Nicene athers, and anathematizing the heresies which *have sprung* p, contrary to it." They allude especially, of course, to the lacedonian denial of the Holy Ghost, and clearly do not sup- ose that they are adding anything new to the Nicene Symbol.

To guard old truth, then, not to assert new, to testify to ancient doctrine, not to excogitate novelties, was the purpose of the Councils so much talked about, so little understood. Had this plain fact been kept in view, what pages of Socinian argumentation against their Definitions, of Popish advocacy of Conciliar infallibility, and the doctrine of Development, might have remained unwritten! How readily might men have seen, that their venerable Symbols, though not the utterances of infallible Judges, were the sufficient and unfailing testimony of competent Witnesses!

One word we take leave to say in conclusion. With the wonted conceit of the school of writers which he represents, the Reviewer, though condescending to say something of what he is pleased to call the "Doctrine of the Tripersonality," still treats it as a thing utterly obsolete and entirely given up by scholars. How obsolete, we should be glad to know! A few score of Unitarian Congregations are no more the Christian world, than the nine tailors of Toovey street were the people of England. Given up by what scholars? By those whose training in theology begins and ends with that extraordinary *curriculum* set forth by the Theological School at Cambridge. We do not charge this insufferable conceit on the Unitarian Communion. Far from it. We gladly recognize among its members, earnest, humble-minded men, who have revolted, not from the Catholic Doctrines of Grace, but from Tritheistic and Calvinistic perversions of them; men, whom we should delight to honor, and to whom we could listen with all respect. But there is, in that Communion, a school, to which we have just alluded, whose conceit is as intolerable as its range is limited; a school, made up of men, who are forever saying,

> "How blest are we that are not simple men;
> Yet nature might have made us such as these,
> Therefore we will not disdain."

Such men, indeed, are everywhere. But the Unitarianism of Massachusetts seems to have nursed them into an exuberant and gigantic growth, hitherto unequalled. And it behooves the better portion of that Communion no longer to permit such persons to thrust themselves before the world, as its accredited representatives.

Art. VI.—DR. CRAIK'S DISCOURSE ON THE UNION.

The Union. National and State Sovereignty alike essential to American Liberty. A Discourse delivered in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at the Capitol in Frankfort, Ky., December 9, 1859. By the Rev. James Craik, D. D.

It is truly refreshing, in these days of intemperate party rife and rancorous sectional animosities, to occasionally hear ie clear, clarion, notes of genuine patriotism. Our noble untry rolls on in its stately course of wonderful prosperity. ur people, happy and contented, live together, securely and ntentedly, enjoying the blessings of a government, the ob- ct both of their pride and their affection; whilst our poli- ians, as a class, intent upon the accomplishment of sectional lvantages, or petty personal purposes, seem utterly uncon- ious of the mighty interests which they are jeopardizing, and ish madly on in their selfish career, sometimes shaking to its ep foundations the splendid edifice which our forefathers ected, at such a precious cost of labor and of blood.

We say, our politicians as a class; for we have no doubt at many an honest man, in the mighty legion of office-hold- s, office-hunters, and office-fillers, is conscientiously devoting is best energies to the promotion of the true interests of his untry, as he understands them. But it is undoubtedly true at the trade of politics is demoralizing in its influence upon s votaries, and that its votaries, in the mass, are demoralized y it. The theory of our forefathers, that Government is es- blished solely for the good of the people,—that offices are eated simply as the working instruments of the machine,— nd that the best man for the place is the only principle of the lection of officers,—this beautiful theory of the working of a irtuous Republic has long since practically passed away, and y modern politicians has, probably, scarcely been heard of as historical fact; whilst, in its place, has been substituted the odern notion, that Government is a fat goose, which, at the

behests of party, it is quite right to pick incontinently; that offices are instituted for the benefit of office-holders, and that they are fit subjects of compensation for party services, to be conferred irrespective of the fitness of the recipients for the performance of their duties—spoils, in fact, of party conquerors, to be distributed, as rewards, not only amongst the officers and soldiers of the conquering army, but also amongst the followers and sutlers of the camp. We speak in no partizan spirit. We fear, indeed, that all parties, at the present day, occupy this one common platform, and deem their political existence dependent upon standing boldly upright upon all its planks.

It must not be supposed, however, that we are insensible to the truth that parties are essential to the working of any representative Government. On the contrary, we are quite sensible that single men can do nothing, as individuals, acting each by himself, towards moulding, or controlling, the great common mind of the people. This fact is palpable and undeniable. The gregarious, thinking mass ought to be, and must be, both consulted and directed, and can only be thus consulted and directed, by organized effort; and such organized effort, by whatever name it may be called, is, in fact, Party. And we freely admit, that, as all parties, to be of any value, must both profess, and possess, some definite national principles of action, it must follow, as a necessary consequence, that all of those important political positions, which control the working of the Governmental Political Machine, should be occupied by persons holding those political principles, and earnestly intent upon carrying them out in practice. This is expedient, right, necessary. The Infinite mind, alone, is capable of so arranging antagonistic mental forces, as to constitute them efficient instruments in working out harmonious results; finite man must be content to employ harmonious wills, and concurrent minds, to effect his purposes.

As Christian patriots, we may justly recognize these reasonable claims of party, whilst we deplore the demoralization which debases a just principle by making it the pretext, and even the necessary reason, for a practice which is subversive of all self respect in the appointing power, and of all virtue in

he people. If we have not too highly colored our picture of he present demoralized condition of party principles, and we erily believe that we have not, then how justly may we reiterte the sentiment with which we commenced, that we welome, from our inmost soul, every voice of genuine patriotism, alling upon us to recognize our bonds of common brotherhood, ur glorious privileges as a freeborn people, and our common uties as a nation, charged with the sacred trust of perpetuatng and perfecting those splendid institutions for the self-govrnment of man, which have so long continued to be both the ronder and the admiration of the world.

For this reason do we welcome the Discourse whose title we ave placed at the head of our Article; and gladly would we ee the example of its reverend author imitated by others of is brethren, both in the Church and amongst all denominaions of Christians around us, in thus, with a statesman's eye, arefully studying the sacred Charter of our Nationality, and, ith a Christian pen, describing (in an appropriate manner nd place,) the common privileges conferred by it, and depictng the awful consequences which would necessarily flow from ven an attempt at its destruction.

We religiously believe that this great instrument is a Heaven-irected compilation, and that it embodies a more profound nsight into the practical wants of a great people, more thoough appreciation of all of the rights of man which can be ecured by human Government, and a wiser provision of the ppropriate political machinery for securing those rights, than as ever before exhibited by the minds of mortal men. Beieving this, and sympathizing most sincerely with the objects f our reverend author, we would not say a word to detract rom the salutary influence of his Address. His earnest, honst zeal in the cause, is worthy of all praise. His eloquent apeals to the patriotism of the people, can scarcely fail to waken sympathetic feelings in every part of our common ountry. And his scathing rebukes of sectional animosities nd strifes ought to create such a nationality of feeling, and f objects, as to erase forever from the minds of our people all houghts of geographical lines of demarcation. We hail him

heartily, therefore, as a faithful, earnest, eloquent, and powerful, coöperator in the great work of perpetuating our Nationality; and if, in the examination which we propose to make of some of the facts, positions, and principles of this Address, we shall be found to differ essentially from the reverend author, we beg both him, and our readers, to believe that we express our dissent, simply because we are so fully persuaded that our common object is the cause of truth, and that truth can only be permanently established by just reasoning upon actual facts.

Our Author prefaces his argument with a brief, but felicitous, vindication of his position as a Minister of Christ, in making such an Address, and with a clear, and statesmanlike reference to the peculiar position of our people, educated by the circumstances of the times to a practical appreciation of the true principles of human liberty and human rights. He then concisely states the absolute necessity of some government for man, and the inevitable evils of absolute governments, and the gradual growth, out of the experience of men, of limited constitutional Governments. He styles these Governments, "limited," "complicated," "mixed," and lays it down as *their principle*,

"That the vast powers necessary to constitute an efficient civil Government shall be so divided between a number of distinct and independent depositaries, and the interests and feelings of these several holders of the sovereign power shall be so various and contrariant, that they may check and restrain each other, when either wishes to do harm, and only combine, and move harmoniously together, when they are striving to carry out the legitimate purposes of government."

And further on, he remarks, that

"The framers of the Federal Constitution undoubtedly intended to construct every part of their work upon this admirable principle."

Assuming this to be the principle upon which the Constitution of the United States is established, our Author proceeds from this stand-point to discuss the powers granted by the instrument, and the restraints upon State jurisdiction contained in it, (taking various positions in the course of his argument to which we propose, by and by, to refer,) and, after insisting that the antagonism of the separate authority of the General and State Governments is the true conservative element of the Constitution, concludes with an appeal, powerful, eloquent and argumentative, against all attempts, fanatical on one side, or

ish on the other, to alter or destroy our great Charter of erty.

Ve do not propose, in the first instance, more particularly to ow out the course of argument of our Author, but rather, ng his Address as the text for our remarks, to express our rs of the real principle of our Federal Government, and of conservative elements contained in it; and then, afterward, iscuss some of the facts and positions taken by him as ing upon our mutual duties and relations, as fellow citizens ne Republic.

ur Author (page 10 of the Address), would seem to divide Governments into two classes, viz.: "simple" and "com-ated." In the first class, he evidently includes pure Mon-y, Aristocracy and Democracy; all of which he equally es "despotisms." And in the second class he comprises all ted Governments, and styles them, as we have before re-ked, "limited," "complicated" and "mixed." It would, probably, have saved him from, what we deem, the great r of his argument, had he given to our Government its r proper and distinctive appellation of "Constitutional;" had he, then, carefully studied the all-important meaning hat appellation.

ur Government is, emphatically, a Constitutional Repub- and in endeavoring to discover the true principle upon ch it is founded, it is important to know that it is the only reme Government which has ever existed in the history of race, which claimed no power, except such as is conferred ts charter of creation. All other Supreme Governments n the right to exercise all power, from which they are not rained by a Constitution or Grant, from themselves; ours ns only to exercise such powers as are granted to it.

he Government of Great Britain, for instance, (which, next urs, is the nearest known approach to a Sovereignty with ffective Constitution,) is only a limited Government, in so as the Crown has granted to the people specified privileges. Legislative power is absolute, and physical impossibilities itute its only limitation, whilst the Judiciary is subject arliament only. This Constitution may, with great sem-

blance of truth, be said to be founded upon the principle laid down by our Author. King, Lord, and Commons, are mutually a check upon each other, and constitute the only opposing forces, each, to the absolutism of the others. But the difference between that Constitution, and ours, is radical and complete. The Executive, Legislative and Judicial Departments of our Government are each invested with certain specified powers, which relate exclusively to international affairs, and to the intercourse of citizens of different States with each other; every power bestowed will be found, upon examination, to fall within that scope, and no other. In the due exercise of these powers each Department is, expressly, made Supreme and uncontrollable; but any action of either the Executive or Legislative Department, beyond those powers, is utterly void, as being done without jurisdiction. Ample provision is made for the peaceable punishment of the Executive for any wilful abuse, or breach, of his powers; and the Judiciary corrects unconstitutional legislation by its simple fiat of annihilation. The Judiciary, it is true, is not, and from the nature of the case, could not be, subject to review; but any action by it, in an individual case, which may be deemed to extend its jurisdiction beyond the intentions of the people, can be corrected, by an express provision, in a peaceable alteration of the Constitution, and such alteration the Judiciary is utterly powerless to prevent.

This then is the theory of our General Government, and this is the principle upon which it is founded. A National Government for the management, solely, of our international affairs, and the intercommunication of the citizens of different States with each other; supreme within the scope of its granted powers; and subject to peaceable and efficient remedies for any undue assumption of powers not granted, or any abuse of its actual powers.

We claim that it is not, when duly appreciated, "very intricate and complicated upon paper;" but that, on the contrary, it is simple and plain, embracing, of necessity, many provisions, since the powers it was intended to convey are enormous in extent, and of vital consequence; but combining

these powers into one beautiful and harmonious whole. What can so emphatically prove this as its quiet and triumphantly successful action in peace and in war; first supporting and sustaining an infant Nation, struggling for a precarious existence; then regulating and controlling the growing strength of young giant power, until finally, that power, in the full vigor of an early, but ripe maturity,—acknowledging no superior by land or by sea, a sovereign amongst sovereigns—can now proudly point to the great Charter of its Liberty, as the unshattered and unchanged constitution of its being.

We do not contend that our venerated Constitution is absolutely perfect, or that it will so govern man as to make him perfect. There is, and can be, but oneperfect government; and that, the direct handiwork of the Almighty, has now, for more than six thousand years, been exerting its silent, steady and patient influence upon the stubborn hearts and wills of our fallen race; and we must all admit that we are still very far from perfection. Let us not then expect too much from our Government, and we shall be the less likely to complain of imperfections which are inseparable from the works of man, and to clamor for changes without knowing whether they will mar, or improve our enviable condition.

But we do most emphatically deny that the theory of our Government has, in any just sense of the term, proved a failure. We regretted extremely to read all that portion of our Author's Address, from the 11th to the 16th pages inclusive, in which he labors to establish that it has so proved, and also to show that the Constitution was not the creative work of the Convention which framed it. What we have already said we trust has tended to show that there has been no failure in this great and beautiful theory, and we propose directly to consider the other point, the true paternity of the Instrument. But the gravity and importance of the charge as to its failure requires that we should first more fully consider it, and the arguments adduced to support it.

The charge is, that the Constitutional checks and guards provided to restrain the Government, and the several Departments of it, within their prescribed limits, have proved a fail-

ure. And what now, we ask, in all candor, of our Author, and of our readers, are the facts of history to support this charge?

The Executive authority has been wielded by fifteen persons, and in the exercise of its great powers, nearly all of these have performed acts which encountered at the time the deadly hostility of a powerful opposition, and certainly, in one case, of a large majority also of the people of the United States; and that too upon the question of the Constitutional power of the President in the premises. No impediment ever existed to the exercise of the power of impeachment on the part of his accusers, and yet in what case was a President ever impeached, and tried, or in what instance did the Court, for the trial of impeachments, ever fail to perform its duty? Nay, which of the Presidential acts, that was the most vilified at the time, can be pointed to, which has not since become a general favorite with the people? Time certainly does work wonders, and not the least wonderful of its effects has been exhibited, in its operation upon "the sober, second thoughts of the people!"

Again. Congress, in the exercise of its powers, has passed numerous laws, upon subjects over which there were grave doubts in respect to its jurisdiction? The subjects of legislation have been of such absorbing interest in themselves, or of such vital importance to sections of the country, or classes of the people, that the law has encountered the hottest opposition to its passage, and the most obstinate and persevering resistance to its execution. The august tribunal, entrusted by the Constitution with the discharge of this most delicate and responsible duty, has never shrunk from its post, or wavered in its course; and much as the opinions of individual members of the Court have been criticized, and even sometimes maligned, the solemn decision of the Court, upon the Constitutionality of the law, has met with universal obedience, and its correctness has seldom afterwards been doubted or denied.

The Supreme Court, our Author says, "is in a very slight degree, if at all, a political institution." Most happily this is so. And deeply do we always regret, when, by contrivance of politicians, mere partisan questions are submitted to its decision. Partisans do not seek to be convinced, but to

ı: and the clear atmosphere of pure and simple reason is, refore, poorly calculated to satisfy their aspirations. But submit, that this fact is a very inconclusive argument to w, that the Court has failed to perform the duties assigned it by the Constitution. Its inability to enforce its Decrees ı mere phantom of the imagination of our Author; for, rly a century of actual experience has demonstrated the t, that all of its mandates are instantly obeyed, without even, a single instance, calling for a shadow of coercion.

Where then is the failure in the Theory of our Government? e insist that there is none. On the contrary, we claim that s one of the most powerful arguments to be used in advo-ing, with the people, a continued love for, and constancy in intaining, the Constitution, that its practical working has, y by day, made the fact more apparent, that its principle is in ct accordance with the wants of the people; and that, utiful as it is as a paper compilation, its true merit con-ts in the perfect adaptation of its working qualities to bind ether, in harmonious unity, the people of a continent, leav-; to their own home State institutions, the care and manage-nt of those diversified domestic interests, which a distant vernment can never fully understand, or duly administer.

In our discussion of this question of failure in theory, it ll be perceived that we have not examined the arguments ed by our Author in its support. We could not do so with-t destroying the unity of our own argument, inasmuch as differ *in toto* in our views of what that theory is. Jus-e to him and to ourselves, however, requires that we should w take a cursory glance at his arguments. And, with all pect, we think we shall be able to show that if his argu-nt does not confute itself upon this point, it is at least fal-ious and inconclusive. And we preface our examination by ring, that we have hoped, in our argument, and do hope, in s examination, to demonstrate his error, because we think at the positions taken by him, and his arguments in support them, are directly calculated to weaken confidence in, and stroy respect and affection for, the Constitution.

At page 10, we find "sovereignty" defined to be, the powers vested in a government.

At page 12, we read,

"That sovereignty resides ultimately in the people, is a principle which lies at the foundation, perhaps, of all Governments, certainly of all popular Governments."

And farther down upon the same page, we find our own Government spoken of as one,

"In which the ordinary powers and attributes of sovereignty were designed to be vested exclusively in the great body of the people, to be by them directly and habitually exercised, in the ordinary administration of affairs."

And again, on pages 14 and 15, it is said,

"So far, then, as the action of the Federal Government alone is concerned, the majority of the people of the whole Union is the sovereign power, the actual Government of the United States; and our system is, therefore, looking to that Government alone, a simple Democracy."

We bring these extracts, (not garbled, but expressing the full meaning of our Author in the place where they appear,) into juxtaposition, for the purpose of showing that, according to his own expressed views of the design of the framers of the Constitution, he fails to show a failure in its Theory, as he understands it; but, on the contrary, that, if he is right in his statement of the practical result of its working, it has, in practice, simply fulfilled the design of its framers. It seems indeed most palpable that our Author, in thus defining the design of the framers of the Constitution, emphatically either contradicts himself, or stultifies the Convention; for, in the first place, (page 11,) he informs us, that

"The framers of the Federal Constitution undoubtedly intended to construct every part of their work upon this admirable principle, that the vast powers, necessary to constitute an efficient civil government, shall be so divided between a number of distinct and independent depositaries, and the interests and feelings of these several holders of the sovereign power shall be so various and contrariant, that they may check and restrain each other, when either wishes to do harm, and only combine and move harmoniously together, when they are striving to carry out the legitimate purposes of Government."

And then, on the very next page, he describes our system of Government as one,

"In which the ordinary powers and attributes of sovereignty were designed to be vested in the great body of the people, to be by them directly and habitually exercised in the ordinary administration of affairs."

The two positions seem to be diametrically opposite. And if, as we have cited from him, (page 15 of the Address,) it is true that "the action of the Federal Government" has merely carried out the design expressed in the latter extract, then principle and practice have simply gone on harmoniously together.

But our object is to show here the fallacy of the argument of our Author, that, in fact, there has been a failure in the practical operation of the principle of the Constitution, as announced, page 11 of the Address. He asks, somewhat triumphantly, "does the great fact which we have announced in regard to the practical working of American Institutions, require to be proved?" We answer, most emphatically, it undoubtedly does! And as he seems to be of the same opinion, let us see how he proceeds to prove it.

We admit fully that things are things, and that names do not alter them. If our Government has in fact become a Despotism, the name of Constitutional Republic will not alter that fact. To the proof then of the fact! The argument is opened, page 13, by the citation of what is announced to be a fact, illustrative of "the change that has passed upon a part of our system." We cite, verbatim, our Author's statement:

"The first officer of our Government was designed to be chosen by the mature wisdom of Electoral Colleges, composed of men selected from the body of the people on account of their experience, judgment, and integrity. So many separate and independent bodies, thus admirably constituted, were deemed to be the best possible provision for the safe and wise discharge of the most difficult and dangerous feature of a republic, the election of a Chief Magistrate. It is well known that under the actual working system, the Electoral Colleges have never been anything but cumbrous and superfluous instruments for signifying to the Central Government the choice of the President, already made by the people in their primary assemblies. And it is very probable that the majority of the voters do not know that there is any such intermediate machinery, composing a part of our Institutions."

Now as history informs us that the voice of the whole Nation, from the moment of the adoption of the Constitution, called upon George Washington as the person, and the only person, to be thought of as their first President, it seems to us that in connection with this historical truth, a single question will be sufficient to show the fallacy of the argument founded

upon his asserted "fact." Suppose that, in "the mature wisdom of the Electoral Colleges," they had disregarded the known wishes and will of the people, and had elected some John Brown as President, does any one believe that the aforesaid John Brown would have been permitted to organize the Government?

In our judgment, "the cumbrous and superfluous instruments" are quite as likely in 1860 to elect a man, (if they elect at all,) who is not the choice of the whole people, as they were in 1788. And we greatly fear that, if any change has been wrought in the working of this part of the political machine, the danger is, that it will be found to be, that Electoral Colleges may hereafter elect upon the principle of outside partisan pressure, rather than from an over-anxious desire to fulfil the wishes of the people. We greatly doubt both the principle and the fact asserted by our Author. We do not believe that the framers of the Constitution intended to provide machinery for the election of a President who was not the choice of the people. And we are quite sure that there has been no increase of virtuous respect for the will of the people on the part of Electoral Colleges.

We are no special advocates of the "cumbrous and superfluous" Electoral Colleges, and think that it, not improbably, would have been as well to have left them out of the machine, but, we insist, that in their practical working, they have never yet failed to perform any conservative functions which were expected from them.

The remainder of the argument of our Author consists in; First, the assertion of the fact, that "the Lower House of Congress, and the President, as the immediate representatives of the people, are at once prepared to register and execute the decrees of a popular majority;" (an assertion which the numerous unpopular laws passed by Congress, and the constant "vetoes of the President," would seem to render sufficiently doubtful to require some proof in its support). Second, the suggestion that the Senate, although conservative in its construction, may still be found to be composed of a sufficient number of men too timid, or too fallible, to be relied upon to

support the rights of their States; (a possible weakness, which the actual conduct of Senators for eighty years past is not well calculated to make us believe to be so probable, as to be deemed imminently dangerous.) And lastly, that the Supreme Court is not to be relied upon, because it is not to any considerable extent a political institution; can only decide upon such cases as may be submitted to its jurisdiction; and is powerless to enforce its Decrees; (this last position we have already fully answered in another place.)

We have honestly intended to state fairly the whole argument of our Author, and we believe that we have done so. And we confidently submit that it does not establish the conclusions which he deduces from it; viz: that so far as the construction of the General Government alone is concerned, its conservative elements are a complete failure; and that so far as its action alone is concerned, it is "a Simple Democracy, as dangerous to liberty as any other Despotism."

Indeed, we would gladly think that our Author uses language on this subject much stronger than he intended, were it not that he over and over again reiterates the assertion, and, at each subsequent time, with an increased emphasis. And we soon find, in the development of his pet idea of what he deems the real conservative principle of our governmental system, the reason for the emphasis with which he denies the existence of any other. Indeed, he prefaces the development of his idea by informing us that he states "the fact of our actual condition in order that we may see our consequent duties and perform them." The deep, dark, shades of all other figures upon the canvass are intended, by their contrast, to give the greater prominence and effect to the one object, which he is about to produce and to clothe in colors of brilliant light.

It seems not to have occurred to him that he might have already proved too much, and that he was now producing a conservative principle, and was endeavoring to persuade us to cherish and sustain it, for the purpose of preserving an utterly worthless System of Government. If the Union is indeed such an utter failure both in theory and in practice, in itself considered, as our Author asserts, would it not follow as a rea-

sonable conclusion, that the "fanatics of the North," the "gasconading politicians of the South," "the little men in Congress, who shake their fists in each other's faces," are not, after all, wholly reprehensible in demanding an Union established upon a better theory, and which will prove more wholesome in practice?

Now, as we believe that "The Union" is a union of States, and a Unity of Sovereignty, and that both were created by, and are dependent upon, the Constitution, and that, as a Government, it is the best ever devised by man; and as we further believe that State Sovereignty is an essential element of that system of Government, we propose to devote the remainder of our Article to the consideration of the Sovereignty of the States, and to the notion of our Author, that it is the only conservative element in the Constitution.

It is a remarkable fact, that every step taken and every act performed, in the formation of the Constitution, are not only historically attested, but are actually matters of record. Why, and by whom, the Constitution was established? are questions to be established solely by reference to the Record. And, as the Constitution in direct terms does deprive the States of some portions of the Sovereignty which usually appertains to an independent Government, it, in one important point of view, is necessary to refer to this record testimony.

Our Author, page 17, in commencing the discussion of this matter, says, "the question has often been mooted, whether the Federal Government is the creature of the States, or whether the States derive their power from the grants and permissions of the Federal Constitution?" The latter clause of this question is quite new to us, and we conclude that it must be the result of a slip of the pen in hasty composition, overlooked in revision. We understand that the only questions ever mooted on the subject have been, whether the Constitution was created by the Sovereign States? or by the People of the several States? or by the concurrent act of both? Our Author contends, that the several States were never at any time separate and Independent Sovereignties: but that a Union has always existed between them. We do not quite understand how the

ndisputed facts of history are reconcilable with his claim upon his subject.

Prior to the Revolution, each Colony possessed its Charter, ranting to it certain political privileges. These Charters did ot constitute Sovereignties, nor did the fact that the Governnent of Great Britain was the Sovereignty which ruled them ll, constitute them United Colonies.

Then came the Revolutionary contest, when common objects nd a common interest, united them in a common resistance; ut from A. D. 1773, when open resistance to the Crown actully commenced, down to the 15th of November 1777, when he Articles of Confederation were formed, no common Govrnment was ever formed between them. The Congress, which at from Sept. 1774, to March 1781, for mutual deliberation, onsultation and advice, had no Governmental powers whatver. Each Colony, down to July 4, 1776, and each State fter that time, acted according to its own discretion, in carryng out, or not, the recommendation of the Congress.

The Articles of Confederation undoubtedly formed a quasi lovernment; but, although this Government had a name xpressly conferred upon it, viz., the United States of Amer-a, yet, as bearing upon this question of State Sove-eignty, it is important to observe, that in all treaties made y it, the individual States were always all named as the ontracting parties; and the whole instrument bears incontes-ible evidence of the fact, that thirteen separate, independent overeignties were contracting together to mutually surrender ertain specified sovereign powers for the common good, each taining to itself all others. Thus, throughout the whole inrument, whereever the terms "United States" are employed, ne word "United" is evidently used as a simple adjective, to enote States in union with each other, and not as a part of ne style of the Government. And again, as if this question f separate sovereignty was the one question which they were ll determined to place in the foreground of their admitted, nd most cherished rights, the agreement commences with,

"Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, risdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the nited States in Congress assembled:"

And to render themselves each doubly secure in this particular, it is next declared, that,

"The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defence, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretence whatever."

Separate, independent sovereignty, could hardly be claimed in stronger terms, or secured by more stringent provisions. And yet, although these Articles were agreed to in the Congress which framed them, in November, 1777, subject to a ratification of the several States, yet, so reluctant were several of the States to part with a portion of their sovereign powers, that a ratification by all of the States was not obtained until the 1st of March, 1781.

We are now prepared to examine the record evidence of the formation of the present Constitution, and see by whose authority it was established. A few years of experience in the working of the Government of the Confederation, established the fact, that the powers conferred upon it were totally inadequate "to provide for the credit, and the wants of the country, or to fulfil the duties and obligations of a General Government." The Congress, in numerous instances, applied to the States for an increase of their powers upon specified subjects, but always without success, until, finally, on the 21st of February, 1787, the following Resolution was passed by them.

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of Congress it is expedient, that on the second Monday in May next, a convention of delegates, who shall have been appointed by the several States, be held at Philadelphia, for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation, and reporting to Congress and the several Legislatures such alterations and provisions therein, as shall, when agreed to in Congress, and confirmed by the States, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union."

Pursuant to this Resolution each of the States, except Rhode Island, by an act of the Legislature, or pursuant thereto, appointed delegates to the Convention; and each expressly limited their authority to the terms of the above resolution, (except New Jersey, whose commission to her delegates authorized them to take into consideration any provision which

"shall appear to be necessary to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies thereof," and did not expressly require them to report to the Congress, or to the Legislature.)

Under these powers the delegates met May 14th, 1787, and, after mature deliberation, finding the old Articles of Confederation too defective to even form the frame work of an effective Government, they assumed the responsibility of laying it aside entirely, and proceeded to construct the present Constitution of the United States. That in doing so they exceeded the powers conferred upon them by the States, was palpable. A Constitution, upon its face purporting to emanate from the people of the United States, to create a Government complete in all of the powers and attributes of Sovereignty, and paramount in those powers to all State authority on the same subjects, could not, with any show of consistency, be claimed to fall within the trust confided to the Delegates. And the Convention were not guilty of the folly of supposing it to be so. The exigency of the times had rendered it necessary that they should assume the responsibility of disregarding the impracticable restrictions upon their powers, and should frame a National Government for all of the people of the several States represented by them. And then, like honest men, conscious of pure motives, and confident that the result of their labors would bear the test of the most thorough examination, they submitted their work for ratification, not only to the Congress of the Confederation, and to the several States, their own constituents, but *also to the people of the United States.* Without the assent of the Congress, and of the several States, their work was a nullity; and except with the concurrence of the Legislature of the several States, and by means of their voluntary action, in each calling a Convention of the people for that purpose, the Constitution could not be ratified by the people.

The Congress did refer the Constitution to the several States, and by its acts did ratify it. Each State did ratify it; and did call *a Convention of its people for the purpose of submitting its ratification to them.* And the people of each State by their own separate, distinct and voluntary action, did also rat-

ify it. And the Congress subsequently passed the necessary laws for organizing the new Government, thus by their own Act, concurred in by the Confederated States, putting an end to their political existence.

Such are the record facts! and, in the face of them, we would ask, in all candor, can it be claimed either on the one hand, that the Government of the United States of America is a simple Confederation, entered into by the several State Governments? or on the other, that it is simply a sovereignty created by the people of the United States? On the contrary, is it not most clear and unquestionable, that our Constitution creates a common Nationality for the whole people of one country, and that its creation was the joint work of the several State sovereignties, and of the people of the several States, each acting separately and of their own free will?

We commenced our examination of this question with the remark, that it was important in one point of view. Of course we referred to the conclusion which is sometimes drawn from the assumption that it is a mere confederacy; viz.: that in that case, the contracting parties has each a right to withdraw from the Confederation. If, as we have hoped to prove satisfactorily, the fact assumed is untrue; then, of course, the conclusion falls to the ground. But we should feel ourselves recreant to our solemn duty, did we not most emphatically protest against any such conclusion to be drawn from the premises, even if they were true.

Our noble Constitution is not a mere contract in which are only interested the contracting parties. It is, on the contrary, a solemn act by which is brought into existence a body politic, which is just as truly "a being" in the family of nations, as man is in the human family; and it is a being too, about which circle, and in which centre interests to each individual of our common country, infinitely more various and important than can ever be predicated of the human being,—individual man,—however great and important he may be, either in his station or in himself. A Washington did die! but the Government of the United States survived, and millions of happy beings still enjoy the blessings which it disseminates! Thirteen States and their people only, were the contracting and

acting parties in creating it. No new State since received within its embrace, and not one human being since born into subjection to its jurisdiction, has by any solemn contract ratified it, but it has descended to us all as a common inheritance. It is ours, our property, and if we be true sons of those noble fathers, who were its and our progenitors, we shall, as a band of brothers, each to the other, pledge, in its support, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

We have said that it is the pet idea of our Author that the individual States are the only efficient, conservative principle of the Constitution. The States are a most essential part, unquestionably, of our system. The home management, only by a home government, of the diversified domestic interests of the people, we have shown to be the novel principle of our Constitution. But the State Governments exist outside, and independent of the General Government. Their jurisdiction is simply curtailed by the Constitution, and can hardly, in any just sense, be termed either *the*, or *a* conservative principle of it. As bodies politic, with organized powers inherent in themselves, they are certainly powerful to support their own rights against encroachment; but true conservatism in a governmental system, has always its two sides, to prevent encroachment upon, and by, the sovereignty. For the latter purpose, State Governments armed to the teeth may be very powerful instruments against an inimical and antagonistic power; but how thirty-three independent powers, each fully represented in the General Government, and each, in itself, controlled by the very interests which its representatives in the General Government have sustained, are likely to prove peaceful and harmonious controllers of the action of that General Government, in any given contingency, is not, by our Author's argument, made clear to our comprehension.

He must permit us then to believe that our Constitution does embrace within itself peaceable and efficient conservative checks—balance wheels of its own—well adapted and fully competent to regulate and control the whole action of our political machine; that the machine itself, although composed of numerous wheels, and intended to perform various func-

tions, is yet so admirably constructed, that each wheel works smoothly in the cogs of its fellow, and that all, moved by the great main spring of the Nation's affectionate confidence and support, will work on,—as in time past, so in time to come,—continually furnishing to ourselves new political fabrics adapted to our common wants, and, to the world at large, samples of work done, challenging both their admiration and imitation.

Checks upon the exercise of official power, and in restraint of mal-administration, arising from unregulated ambition, the madness of party, or the innate selfishness or wickedness of man, however perfect those checks may be in themselves, must of course depend upon human agency for their efficiency. Our system, admirable as it is, can only be operated by the brains and muscles of our people. If we believe our system of Government a good one—if we see no principle in it, except such as, duly directed, is well calculated to promote the happiness, and protect the liberty of the people, let us, one and all, resolve to preserve our form of Government in its entirety. If, in its course upon the sea of politics, our noble ship ever pursues a devious course, endangering, now and then, smaller vessels freighted exclusively with State interests, the fault is wholly either in the helmsman, or the crew; let us strive to regulate her future course by the diligent use of the conservative remedies placed in our hands. Her officers and crew are creatures of our appointment, and, with due diligence in their selection, the great ship will sail triumphantly on in one steady course, whilst our smaller State vessels, each in its appropriate place, will ride securely in the smooth waters of her wake.

Fellow Citizens, we are one people—brethren of one family. Brotherly love, guided by genuine patriotism, could alone construct our admirable Government; and brotherly love and genuine patriotism can alone administer and preserve it! The great heart of the Nation is sound! We know (from a long and extensive political connection with Northern men,) that our Southern brethren may rely, with perfect security, upon the equal readiness of the great body of Northern men to preserve in their integrity the rights of every section of our common country. Enthusiasts, fanatics, and blatant politi-

ians, may rave as they please; but, so long as the smoke which they may create shall not be fanned into a flame by outrageous acts of sectional aggression, the masses of either section of the Union will witness their ravings with silent contempt.

They love their country and honor its institutions; and, as they mutually love each other, so they will mutually unite in maintaining their common Nationality. The glorious spectacle exhibited by our own National Church, in its last triennial session, is but a type of the Nationality of our people. Who that witnessed its catholicity and its fraternity, in the midst of scenes of outside excitement never before equalled in our land, can doubt that the great National heart is still sound to the core?

The venerated banner of our country floats proudly in the breeze. The unchanged stripes of the "Old Thirteen" snap bold defiance to all outside interference. And in its azure field the stars of the sister States, each of equal magnitude, clustered in loving and harmonious contiguity, significantly represent The Union as it is. Should any rash hand ever be extended to pluck one star from that glorious constellation, with all fraternal kindness, but with solemn earnestness we would say, Brother, hold! that splendid galaxy represents our common Mother; spare us the agony, thyself the crime, and mankind the awful spectacle of such a monstrous matricide!

Art. VII.—THE FREE CHURCH SYSTEM.

There is no subject now before the American Church, at all to be compared, in importance, with that of the Free Church System, as we shall endeavor to show before the conclusion of this Article. It does not involve, as many suppose, the mere question of dollars and cents, and the pecuniary support of the Clergy, though it possesses the only key which can unlock the treasures of worldly wealth, and pour them freely out upon the altar of God. But that is not the point mainly to be considered; for it lies at the very foundation of the whole primitive working plan of the Church, and is the mighty lever by which, alone, her Ancient Discipline and power can be restored, her present defective machinery of action rectified, and her energies concentrated upon the great objects of her mission and organization. We rejoice, therefore, that this subject has been re-opened for the consideration of Churchmen, and we cannot but hail its further discussion, in all the Periodicals of the Church, as one of the most propitious signs of the times.

We do not intend, in this Article, to unfold the argument for the Free Church System. That would be an unnecessary task. For, not only has the great argument been unfolded, again and again, in this Review, but, so far as the principle is concerned, no reply has ever been attempted, nor is there probably any individual who is not already convinced that it is the only system which has the sanction of Holy Scripture, of primitive antiquity, and of Catholic usage and authority. So far as the principle is concerned, therefore, the battle has been fought and the victory won. In proof of this, we have only to appeal to the concessions and acknowledgments of every writer who has ventured an attack; for these attacks have all been based, not upon any defect in the arguments by which the System is sustained, but upon the impracticability, and fancied impossibility, of acting upon it, in the present state of the Church and of the world. Of this we have a very remark-

able illustration in the two Articles which have recently appeared in this Review, entitled "Free Churches and Pews," the main positions of which we propose to examine.

The writer of these Articles comes before us, not only as "the friend of Free Churches in theory," but as one who has "proved the sincerity of his friendship by years of earnest toil in their service;" and moreover, he confesses that "it has pleased our Divine Master to crown with great and singular blessing the enterprise to which his own energy has been mainly directed;" and yet, notwithstanding his own experience of its success, he believes "its universal or general adoption, *in this country*, is impossible." Most extraordinary is this announcement—placing the writer in the same unfortunate predicament with the English nobleman, who wrote a book to prove that man does not need the aid of Divine Revelation to guide him in his conduct, and then prefaced his book with the narrative of a remarkable vision, in answer to prayer, sanctioning its publication by Divine authority, and not thinking that the arguments of his book were proven to be false by the facts of his own experience. At all events, both could not be true. And so we argue in the present instance, that there must be some mistake, either in the conclusions of the writer, or in the facts of his own experience; and we also insist, that if such a worker in the free Church cause, with such views of the System, and of the radically defective organization of the Church in this country, as are developed in these Articles, could have been so remarkably successful, then there can be no doubt of its general success, especially when it comes to be sanctioned and sustained, as it ought to be and will be, by the coöperation of all Churchmen.

But it may, perhaps, be said, that our inference here is unfair, inasmuch as the writer maintains that his experience has proved "the practicability of the System, under certain favoring circumstances," though at the same time "the impossibility of its general adoption in this country." But is this great question to be settled by the inference of the writer from his own peculiar experience, at the same time that he withholds from us his name, and the name of the Parish, and the favor-

ing circumstances under which he acted! Possibly the true teaching of his experience is directly the reverse; and every other individual but himself would come to the conclusion, that if he could succeed, in such a Parish, and under such circumstances, then there is no place and no Parish and no country, in which the System would not live and thrive. Such is our inference; and, having some idea of the facts, we hold ourself prepared to show, when the name is given, that no Pewed Church could ever have survived the prejudices and oppositions, and strange vicissitudes and disasters of the Parish referred to, and that nothing but the Free Church System, under God, has kept it alive and made it successful and triumphant.

But this "telling of experiences" is a curious thing, and when a man gets upon that track, he ought to be sure that his experience is extensive enough to enable him to speak with authority. Now what has been the experience of this writer in the working of the Pew System? We rather suspect that under that System he is a new recruit, and that when he has tugged away for years to make it successful, without the accomplishment of any of the objects of the Church's mission, he may then change his mind, and may discover, what some of his brethren have already discoverd, from their experience, that it is a system which dries up the fountain of benevolence in the human heart, and is at war with the whole spirit of the Gospel. Already we think we perceive in the tenor of the Articles under review, a sort of general disgust with the working of every system *in this country;* and we should not wonder if the writer at last came to the conclusion of a certain gentleman at the West, who used to say, that "he had experienced religion in all the different denominations, and though he did not doubt its truth, yet he was convinced that it would not work in this country—our people are too wicked—we must have more law—the union of Church and State, or something equivalent." Indeed, such it seems to us is the plain meaning of the Articles in question; for the writer acknowledges that the Free Church System alone is divine, but maintains that neither this system or any other can fully succeed in this "Mod-

Church," until "her lost inheritance is restored to her," restoration of which, in his judgment, is "an evident and plete impossibility at present;" and he defends the Pew tem only as a necessity, because we, in this country, have law, and "none of the official control which the ancient rgy had over the Laity." All this looks very much like language both of disgust and despair, not of the Church ıe, but also of the country.

But we pass on to the consideration of more important top-

No advocate of the Free Church System has ever ex-ıed himself more strongly than does this defender of the ssity of rented Pews. Speaking of that System, he says, only that "it has the unquestionable authority of primi-ı practice," but "is the only one thoroughly accordant with spirit of Christianity, the freeness and fullness of Christ's emption, and the general precepts of the Word of God." ain he says, "We agree fully with the Scriptural and Cath-: doctrine which lies at the basis of the Free System, and ıld rejoice if any Church in our Communion could be placed that basis." Again, "The advocates of the Free System unquestionably right in the position that it was the System primitive, and even of Apostolic times, and that it is still System of the major part of that great body of the Church holic, the Oriental Church, the Church of Rome and the glican Communion. We who have adopted the Pew Sys-ı are the undoubted minority of the Catholic Christians on face of the earth." Again, referring to the "selling of Pews onsecrated buildings," this writer says, "We do not see r this practice can be defended for a moment. It is, to our ıd, monstrous, abominable, sacrilegious."

Now we plant ourselves upon these concessions and acknowl-ements, not because they have any special authority, but ause we believe them to express the undoubted conviction very individual, who has ever seriously thought upon the ject, or examined the argument, and because, no doubt, had een possible, the writer would have been glad to escape the ssity of making them. May we not repeat, then, that so as the great principles are concerned, which lie at the basis

of the Free Church question, and the Free Church System, the battle has been fought and the victory won.

What then is the position of the advocates of the Free Church System, with respect to its opponents? It is undoubtedly and precisely the position of the Christian Minister, in a Congregation of men, who profess to acknowledge the truth of the Christian religion, and yet have not the heart, or soul, or faith, or courage, to act upon their convictions. In such a case, he is not to go back and reason with them as with open and avowed infidels, constantly placing before them the evidences of divine truth, but he is to go forward, meeting objections, overcoming difficulties, allaying fears, addressing the conscience, and by all the instrumentalities with which God has endowed him, he is to persuade them to live and act as Christian men, coming up resolutely and manfully to the work, that they may receive the reward of faithful soldiers and servants. Such, we humbly conceive, is the high mission of the advocates of the Free Church System, at this time and age of the Church and of the world. All good men know that we are right. Their hearts and consciences, and inward convictions, are with us. But the prevailing Pew-rent System is so interwoven into the whole texture and framework of society, and has so long constituted the source of revenue to the Church, and the only means of support of the clergy, that it seems to many as impossible now to change, as for "a nation to change its Gods." Nevertheless, the change must come. No human power or prejudice can long resist the force and testimony of divine truth upon this subject; and no individual, who believes in the ultimate triumph of the truth, can doubt the grand and glorious result.

Here then is unfolded the great practical question now before the American Church with reference to the Free Church System. Not—has it the undoubted sanction of the Word of God? Is it "the only System thoroughly accordant with the spirit of Christianity?" Was it the System of the Primitive Church? Is it truly Catholic and Apostolic? For these questions have already been settled, and there is not probably any Bishop, Priest, Deacon or Layman in the Church who does not know,

nd who must not in his heart acknowledge, that so far as hese questions are concerned, there is not the slightest ground ither for controversy or difference of opinion. But the great ractical question is, shall we act upon this system? We hurchmen, who profess especially to be governed by the Word f God as interpreted by the usages and practices of the Prim- ive Church; we, the members of the American Church, now ying the foundations of her future usefulness and glory; ow elevated in this land to a position of freedom and inde- endence, not enjoyed by any Branch of the Church of Christ ince the days of Constantine; now free and untrammeled by he political powers of the world, and by the corrupt union of hurch and State, and therefore able to place ourselves upon he primitive model—we, the only possessors in all Christen- om of the pure Faith, and the essential organization of the an- ient Church, and alone able to represent her, as she was in the ays of her Apostles and Martyrs, not as a creature of man's evising, but as an Institution of heaven, the kingdom of God n earth, not for man to receive her, and change her, and mold er to his caprices, but for man to be received by her, and with he open arms and warm embraces of her Redeemer and Lord;— hall we realize our position, and have the faith and courage o act upon that System, which we acknowledge to be Divine, nd without which our efforts for the conversion of the world annot be attended by the power and blessing of Almighty od? That is the question. For, as Churchmen, we are pre- isely in the condition of men who see, and know, and under- tand, and acknowledge the truth upon this subject; and all he light in the universe could not make the path of duty lainer than it is. But are we prepared to walk in it? Have e faith to go forward, in spite of all the difficulties, discour- gements, trials and sufferings, which may stand in our way?

O how wonderfully strange, and yet how natural, that just t this peculiar crisis, when we are called upon to act as men f faith and prayer, a spectre should rise before us,—an appa- ition of lions standing in the way,—an incubus of dreams— resenting to the mind the most formidable difficulties and angers, and making us feel as though we had no power to

move hand or foot. How natural, and yet how blessed, when we awake and find it is all a dream, and nothing but a dream. Such, we have no doubt, are all the difficulties, dangers, discouragements, objections, impracticabilities, impossibilities and frightful necessities, now standing in the way of the American Church, impeding her progress, closing her doors to the multitudes who are yearning to be embraced by her, making her a fashionable monopoly, and laying an embargo upon her free and untrammeled action as the Church Catholic of this nation. All are as baseless as the fabric of a dream; and we wonder not that the writer to whom we have referred, and who has grouped them together in kaleidoscopic form, without system or order, should at last have come to the conclusion of a dream —emphatically a "Dream-land Church!"—a Church which never has, and never can, and never ought to be realized, and the conception of which could never have entered into a mind, not disturbed by "dissolving views."

But let us examine into the particulars.

1st. We are told, that

"The Free System, as organized and offered to us in this country, is radically defective in principle, and generally impracticable in use, because it is an attempt to restore one portion of the ancient plan without the organic parts, which are essential to the vitality and efficient working of the whole. It is like the heart, the source of life, deprived of the functions of the lungs, the means of supporting life."

Now, upon the threshold of this apparently formidable and fundamental objection, we pause in amazement, and ask ourselves the question—can it be possible that the person who makes this objection is a Churchman? Is it true that our Branch of the Church Catholic, in this land, is deprived of those "*organic parts* of the ancient Plan, which are essential to the vitality, and efficient working of the whole?" Is it true that anything is wanting in her essential organization—in heart or lungs—to enable her to act with all the power and efficiency of the ancient Church upon the masses of corruption within and around her? Is it true that there is a vital and fatal defect in her organic being and life? No doubt it will be said, that this sweeping and unfounded assertion, was intended to apply only to one of the functions of the body, and

not to its organic parts; and yet it does arraign, as vitally defective, the very sources of life and action, and the whole Article is an attempt to show that, on this account, we must forever remain crippled and paralysed, and so, unable to act upon that Free System, which is acknowledged to be "the system of primitive and Apostolic times, and which is still the system of the major part of that great body—the Catholic Church."

But our reply to the objection, in the first place, is, that it is not true. For the American Catholic Church is a complete, perfect and unmutilated Branch of the Body of Christ, so far as her essential and organic parts are concerned, having the same outward forms of being and the same inward spirit and Life-giving power as when our Saviour breathed upon the Apostles and said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." We deny that the Free Church question, important as it is, has any relation, strictly speaking, to the organic parts of the Church's being, any more than the question, as to whether a man shall stand and walk, or creep and crawl, relates to the organic parts of his being. And what we are contending for simply is, that, having in this country the same Ministry, Doctrines and Sacraments, with which our Saviour originally endowed her, and the same outward position of freedom and independence, and all the elements of life and power, she should here stand erect; not creeping, and cringing, and crawling, for the sake of man, and in fear of support, as a world-bound or State-bound Church; but lifting up her head, as conscious of the divinity of her organization, and the supremacy of her glorious mission, and knowing that "the gates of hell cannot prevail against her." But secondly, we reply, that if it be true, that the Church in this country is wanting in essential and organic parts, then, not the Free System only, but the Pew-selling and renting System, and any other System, must be abandoned, there being no heart, or lungs, or life to sustain them, and make them effectual.

2nd. Our Author, having laid down the broad, sweeping, and most destructive proposition just examined, then specifies, as one of those organic parts wanting among us, "the Parochial Constitution, which makes every individual member of the

Church, within defined limits, a member of the Parish, as was the case in early times;" and then he goes on to argue, that, unless it is a matter of obligation and necessity, that every member of the Church, rich or poor, residing within its limits, belongs to it and contributes, according to his ability, for its support, the Rector having an authoritative voice to that end," then "we labor in vain in behalf of the Free System." In this connection, we have several confident questions. "Where is now our Parochial Constitution, which makes every individual member of the Church within defined limits, a member of the Parish, as was the case in early times?" And then we have an account of the proceedings which would take place, in case a Christian among the European or Oriental laity should come to his Priest and propose to change his Parish Church, without changing his place of residence, and how the Bishop would send for the offender, and rebuke him, and bring him to terms; a "control over her members, the Church in this country has lost, and who will dare to propose that she regain it?"

Now we reply to this objection, in the first place, by denying, utterly and entirely, that "the Parochial Constitution," to which our Author refers, had any existence at all "in those early times," when the Free System was fully established and acted on in every part of Christendom; and we maintain that no mistake can be greater, than to speak of that "Constitution" either as an organic part of the Church, or as an organic part of the Free Church System. For the original Parishes were Dioceses, embracing generally a city with its adjacent towns and villages, having each its own Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, acting together as members of one body, and for one common object, and the revenues of each and every separate Congregation were paid into a common Treasury, over which the Bishop presided, as the chief administrator, and by which all the Institutions and benevolent operations of the Church within that Diocese or Parish were sustained. The present territorial division into separate and independent Parishes, prevailing in England, and possibly in the Oriental Church, and constituting each the cure of separate and independent Ministers or Rectors, was entirely unknown in the Primitive

urch, and is an outgrowth of State power and Papal cor-tion. We can find no positive trace of it, even in Eng-l, before the twelfth century; and, instead of belonging to Primitive System, or the Free Church System, it belongs, must of necessity belong, to that System by which the urch is bound and fettered to the State; and from which ression, we, in this country, have been mercifully delivered. ı man might as well say, therefore, that we cannot carry the Free System in this country because we cannot enforce Patriarchal System of Abraham, as to say that we cannot y it out, because we cannot enforce the Parochial System England, or of any other country. Nay, more, the Patriar-l System of Abraham had much more to do with the e Church System of Primitive days, than has "the Paro-al Constitution" of a later age; and our Author would have ıe much nearer the truth, if he had maintained that the ochial System, instead of being an indispensable necessity he Free System, is, in fact, even in this country, its great-barrier.

But we reply to the objection, secondly, by acknowledging, t our Author has indeed got hold of an important idea, , that something is necessary to the efficient practical work-of the Free System, which we have lost. But, pardon us saying it, what that something is he does not seem clearly perceive; and he also imagines that it is a barrier to the eral and universal establishment of Free Churches; whereas, ir general and universal establishment would of necessity ore the lost inheritance; and at present it is only a barrier he way of isolated Free Church effort, not insuperable, but arding its progress. We will explain. The Free System, generally understood, is only a part of one great working tem; and it is no doubt true that unless the entire and monious System is re-produced, the isolated parts of it—he *dirjecta membra*"—will not work perfectly, or show the and power of the whole Primitive Plan.

But what are the other parts of the System which we have t? Are they the Parochial Constitutions and arrangements the Twelfth Century, imposed upon our Mother Church by

the united State and Papal Power? Are they the enforcements of Law, to compel the attendance of the people upon their respective Parish Churches, and the payment of their dues, as our Author seems to imagine? Are they the "carnal weapons" of earthly warfare, coercing the obedience of men, making the Churches Free, but enslaving the people? God forbid that we should imagine that anything of this kind is a part of the original Free System of the Gospel, or that we should desire the restoration of the Star Chamber or the Inquisition. Not at all, and when our Author maintains that "high principle, Christian self denial, and holy charity," are not to be relied upon for the support of the Church, and that there "must be some sort of compulsion to secure from Christian worshipers generally the contribution of their substance to the maintenance of Divine ministrations," we cannot but think that he has mistaken, not the Free System of the Gospel alone, but its whole spirit, life and power; and that he would sap the foundation, not of Clerical support only, but of Religion and the Church!

What then are those parts of the Free Church System, essential to its perfect and successful working, which we have in a measure lost? Undoubtedly, they are Small Dioceses, See or City Bishoprics, the Bishop not an occasional visitor among his people, but the efficient head and active overseer, having his Staff of Clergy always armed and equipped for duty; the Daily Service, at least in the Central Episcopal Church; the Weekly Communion always in every Church; all Churches free; and the people free to attend the place of their choice; a common treasury in each Diocese, so that the offerings in one place of worship are the same as the offerings in another; the true Diaconate, "serving tables" and ever busy among the poor and the afflicted, in works of charity and in the performance of the special duties of that office; Catechetical Schools, in which every baptized child must be taught and trained for Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist; the Clergy all supported out of the common Fund, as their necessities require, as brethren of one family and household of Faith; not one in affluence and another in penury, but Paul as rich as

er, and James as poor as John; those who have much having hing over, and those who have little lacking nothing; and n that kind of Discipline which goes after the wanderers . brings them back in repentance, to duty and to God.

luch, in brief, was the Primitive Free Church System in all parts; and we believe, as surely as we breathe, that the ie System upon the same working platform, in all its essen- features, is to prevail in this country in the American urch. That is to say, our Dioceses must be smaller; our arate Parishes, so far as the great interests of the Church concerned, must be cemented into one; our revenues com- ed for the just and equitable support of our poor members, faithful Clergy, and our united holy worship; and our rgies concentrated upon the one great object—the building of the Church in her most holy Faith, and the consequent neration, reformation, conversion and salvation of the ·ld. And although this may now be regarded by some as idle fancy of a "radicalist" or "inexperienced enthusiast," the result is inevitable. The spirit which is tending that r is absolutely irresistible; not merely because it is the rit of the age and of the country, gathering up the liberal ughts and feelings of every hue and variety of character, l directing them into the only safe channel of action; but ause it is the spirit of the Gospel, of true Catholicism and true Religion; and therefore is as sure to come as the sun ure to rise.

ld. But again, says our Author:—

We have no lay discipline, or next to none. We know how this necessity was left ovided for in the Anglican Reformation. The result is, that hardly any Protest- body has less of a law and rule of discipline for the Laity, than have we. We) no code like those of ancient times, of which only portions have come down s, and more than that, we have not the official control which the ancient Clergy over the Laity; and we cannot have it without the ancient parochial structure. at shall we do then? Shall we restore it? We need not argue the absolute ssibility of restoration, in the present state of the Church and of general opin- among us. But if we restore one we must restore the other. The ancient laws t with the ancient limitation of Parishes, and were inseparable from it. Other-) we should have laws, from which one could escape at any time, if he fled into a ah where his irregularities would be overlooked. But the old laws, combined ı the parochial tie, furnished a hold upon the Laity which we have lost. Every iber of the Church was under guardianship, and under efficient control. If he

violated no written law, yet if he did not do his duty, as a faithful Christian towards his Parish Church, he could be subjected to reproof and discipline, and he could not run away to another part of the Fold at his will. No member could abstain from worship (and by "member" we mean "baptized person") or neglect to receive the other means of grace with impunity; and, receiving them, he could not well avoid doing his part toward sustaining them in the house of God. Thus, Churches were free; but in those Free Churches no man was free. Every member was known, and every one must do his duty as a Parishioner. We have said enough to indicate our meaning." .... "The favorite appeal of the advocates of the Free plan is to high principle, to Christian self denial, to holy charity." .... But "pure religious principle is not to be relied upon for the support of the temporalities of the Church." .... "Either there must be law or some other sort of compulsion, to secure from Christian worshipers generally, the contribution of their substance to the maintenance of Divine ministrations." .... "We say, then, that the Free System in this country is an illusion, because it contradicts the whole experience of the past in depending upon love without law."

Now there are some sentiments which we cannot read without a long breath and a deep sigh, and to which we scarcely know how to reply without seeming to reflect upon the feelings which must have prompted their utterance. Such are the unfortunate sentiments above recorded; and we confess our amazement that they could have proceeded from the pen of any Christian writer, at this age of the world, and much more, from that of a member of the American Church. No doubt the writer has said "enough to indicate his meaning;" enough to make his words exceedingly ominous, had he the power of acting upon them; and we think we understand him, for we have heard such language before. It carries us back at once to the darkest day of the Church; and, although there is scarcely any system of intolerance, oppression and persecution, which it might not be thought to justify, for the sake of compelling obedience to the Church and for the support of its temporalities, still we have no doubt the Author only means to express the sentiments which were promulgated and acted on by the old Puritan fathers of New England, viz.: that "the people must be compelled, by law or otherwise, to support the standing order." For it is evident that the Author has no faith or confidence "in high principle, Christian self denial, or holy charity," at least "so far as the temporalities of the Church are concerned," and especially the support of the Clergy, and therefore he takes the ground that there must be

"Law or some other kind of compulsion to secure from Christian worshipers their contributions for the maintenance of divine ministrations." "Churches should indeed be free, but no man should be free in them." Inasmuch, however, as men are free, and we cannot help it, therefore we are compelled to adopt the other alternative; we enslave the Churches, shut them up, close their doors, and only open them at the touch of gold.

Then it is evident—such is the plain meaning indicated by the language—that this writer regards the Church, of which he is a member, as in a very sorry condition "*in this country*," having less power and more freedom than any of the Protestant bodies around us, and so terribly degraded as not to be able to compel her Laity, by force of law, to support their Clergy; and therefore constrained to adopt the unscriptural and uncatholic plan of renting for money the privileges and the blessings of the house of God. Observe, not selling, for that would be "monstrous and sacrilegious," but renting, or as the Scotchman would say, "not playing with the wee devil's fiddle, but with the muckle godly one," and therefore, leasing, year by year, or month by month, continually, so that "the Christian worshiper" cannot feel that he has any special right there, but only that he may be ousted at any moment, and must be ousted, if at any moment he is not fortunate enough to be able to pay his rent. At the same time the language of this Renting System, as interpreted by our Author, is most flattering and complimentary to these gentlemen renters. "As you, Laymen, are a people whom the Church of modern times does not pretend to govern, we ask of you security; the security is rents. Our minister must not starve. But we are not quite sure that he would not, if we should leave him to your mercy." Admirable language from the Church Catholic—the representative of Christ on earth—to her faithful members, and possibly well calculated to secure the rents, to say nothing about the conversion of sinners. However, looking at the security as the all important matter, we must confess that we are decidedly anti-renters; it being financially much safer to sell, taking bond and mortgage for the balance due, and so having a lien upon the property, than it

is to trust to the honesty, integrity or mercy of men, as we must do to some extent, in case of rent. And so far as our experience of the Pew System goes, we always found it very desirable to sell the Pew, subject to an annuity, in which case we had some security for the payment; and we are not a little surprised that so sagacious a financier as the writer we are examining, did not perceive that his plan of renting instead of selling, is one which destroys the security.

But we take a deeper, a more solemn, and a more spiritual view of this whole subject. God forbid that we should not advocate, most earnestly, the restoration of the Ancient Discipline of the Church; but, not the discipline of the faggot and the fire; not the legal, compulsory and unmerciful Discipline, which the words of our Author would seem to contemplate, and which has deluged the world with blood; not a Discipline of brute force or tyrannical power, extorting money and compelling an outward conformity to law; but a Discipline of love, sometimes, indeed, in extraordinary cases, "giving the offender over to Satan," in the hope that, under his grievous tyrannies, he may even "learn not to blaspheme;" but generally, going after the wanderer, as we have said, bringing him back, putting him upon trial, withholding from him the spiritual comforts and consolations of the Church until his repentance; and seeking always, not his gold, not his reluctant and constrained assent, but his present and everlasting salvation, both of body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory. No doubt the restoration of such a Discipline—the Ancient Discipline of the Church—not the Discipline of a later age, when the Church became united to the State, and employed the power of the State to enforce her laws, but the primitive and Apostolic Discipline—is a great and most important subject, demanding the special attention of the Church. At the same time it is a subject which lies at the very foundation of the Free Church System; and we are persuaded that nothing but the general acceptance and adoption of that System can restore it to us. And for this plain reason, that it is a System which elevates the Church at once to the position of a Spiritual Power; not a sham spirituality, pretending to live, and move,

and act, altogether by faith in God, and yet employing the arts and tricks of worldly wisdom and policy to sustain her empire; but positively and actually "the Kingdom of God on Earth," standing if need be, and as the world stands, upon nothing; not upon human shoulders; not upon tortoise backs; not upon outward and compulsory enactments of human authority and power; but upon the great Christian Law of Love. And extending her conquests not by soldiery, or implements of war, or strength of arm, but by the visible tokens of a divine ministry; and so, changing into a paradox the rules of earthly warfare, as did our Saviour, and as His precepts require His Church to do. Advancing by yielding, rising by falling, conquering by suffering, persuading by silence, becoming rich by bountifulness, inheriting the earth through meekness, gathering glory and power by penitence and prayer—God be praised that this is the foundation and the only foundation of the glorious Free Church System, of which we are the advocates in this worldly age, when it seems to be forgotten that "the wisdom of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." Not her basis only, but her life, and strength, and power, is Love—"Love without law," or rather the fulfillment of all law, and of which all her laws are but the exponent, and the only law of God's Kingdom upon earth. And who will deny, who can deny, that our Blessed Lord and Saviour has taught us to conquer the world by Love, to extend truth by Love, to destroy error by Love, to build up the Kingdom of righteousness and peace by the wonder-working power of Christian Love?

Our Author speaks of "the experience of the past," and he imagines that the Free Church System cannot succeed because it contradicts that experience. But one would suppose that the experience of the past had been enough to teach a different lesson, from that of "Law and compulsion," as the sources of revenue and power to the Church. For no fact stands out more prominently upon the pages of history, than the fact that, when the Church began to employ the power and policy of the State to maintain her position and extend her sway, that moment her true glory departed, and she began to fall into the

weak, powerless, and dismembered condition in which we now behold her; the degradation of which is painfully proclaimed by the feeling which confesses that we are obliged to adopt an unchristian and uncatholic method of support in order to save the Clergy from starvation. What an evidence that "they who take the sword shall perish by the sword!" What an evidence that no carnal weapons, or inquisitorial tortures, or compulsory laws of Ecclesiastical discipline and authority, can reach the sensibilities of the human soul, and awaken the tears of penitence, or unlock the treasures of worldly wealth. What an evidence that the only true weapon for the Church to use, is Love, suffering, self-denying and dying Love, if need be; and that, not until the Church shall place herself again upon the primitive platform, and manifest this Love, in all her departments of effort, will she possess the power of God. And then, "in the day of His power will the people offer Him free-will offerings with an holy worship."

But we proceed to the consideration of other objections; and, having shown how baseless and false is our Author's idea of the Primitive Parochial Structure, and Lay Discipline, upon which are founded all his objections, and which he acknowledges to constitute "the difficulty and the impossibility," we shall endeavor to be very brief in our concluding remarks.

4th. Another objection is the want of success. But what is meant by success? Plainly, not "the adding of multitudes daily to the Church of such as shall be saved;" for not one word is said upon that subject, nor is the Pew System considered at all with reference to its power in this respect. Not the enabling of more worshipers to be accommodated in the house of God; for it is acknowledged that Free Churches accommodate, upon "a moderate calculation one third more than Pew Churches of the same size." But by success is meant, simply the paying of the pecuniary expenses of worship; and our Author maintains that the Free System does not pay, and cannot be relied upon in this respect, for the support of the Church. And after saying that he "has much private testimony" upon this point, he asks the following question:

"Is there a Parish Church in the United States, which has been supported by the free-will offerings of the people, for a sufficient time to be called a success,

without one of these exceptional conditions; either the presence of a single man, or two or three men, who, as authors of the enterprise, and having large ability, have stood ready, at considerable sacrifice and great cost to themselves, to make up all deficiencies in the working of the rule, either because they had an enthusiastic love for the principle, or were personally interested to an extraordinary degree, as founders of the enterprise; or the supply of deficiency in the Offertory by forced subscriptions in the Parish, or charity from abroad; or finally, by the good fortune of having a Rector who can provide for himself from private resources, because he has means of his own, or has rich friends who are ready to help him, or resorts to other methods for obtaining at least a part of his livelihood?"

Now we know we could reply to this long question by the most triumphant array of statistical facts, showing the success of Free Churches, under circumstances in which no Pewed Church could live; but we prefer to adopt the Yankee fashion. Is there is a Pewed Church in the United States, depending upon rents for support, which has ever been able to raise up "one single man or two or three men," who have stood ready "at considerable sacrifice and great cost to themselves, to make up deficiencies in the working of the rule?" Are there any members of the Church, in the United States, who have "such an enthusiastic love for the principle" of Pew rents, as to be willing to stand in the gap and sustain "the enterprise" at any cost to themselves? If the Free System has produced one single individual, so "in love with the principle" as to be willing to make sacrifices for it, has it not accomplished more than has ever been or ever can be accomplished by the Pew rent System? Has not our Author such "private information," as to enable him to know a Free Church which has raised more money annually by the Offertory alone, for the support of its expenses, than any Pewed Church of the same size and wealth in the whole United States? Is there any Pewed Church in the United States, which has succeeded by Pew rents alone? Is there any Pewed Church in the United States which has succeeded at all by Pew rents, subscriptions, endowments, or otherwise, unless the Rector has happened to be a man of popular pulpit talents? Have any Pew rented Churches ever succeeded, notwithstanding the abilities of the Rector, unless in favorable localities and in fashionable quarters? Why are Pew rented Churches driven to the necessity of changing their

locations, and desecrating consecrated ground and consecrated property, the moment there is a change in the mere pecuniary ability of the surrounding population? Is it not a notorious fact in all our cities, that the large and elegant Churches are located "in fashionable quarters," and not where they are absolutely needed and required for the convenience of the masses of the people? Would it not be well to introduce some System, by which, when Churches are erected, the question of their location may be settled, not by the worldly and sordid considerations of fashion and money, but by the wants and necessities of the population? Would it not be well to introduce a System, dependent for its success, not upon the mere popular talents of the Clergy as preachers, or upon locations of fashion and money, but upon the truth and promise of Almighty God, and which can call into exercise "the enthusiastic love" of all Churchmen? Is it not a thousand times better and more profitable in the long run, to "suffer loss" for the sake of principle, than to "gain the whole world," by yielding to the demands of present "necessity," and confessedly violating the requirements of Holy Scripture and Catholic truth? Who does not know that the favorite argument of the Infidel against Christianity, and of the Sectarian against the Church, is the want of present success? Have we not reason to believe that offerings upon the altar, in every Church, in every Diocese, and on all occasions of Public Worship, not for this or that particular minister, but for the Church of Christ and for Christ Himself, would create such an emulation between the different Congregations, and such an enthusiasm of love and good works, as would make the System pay a thousand times better than the mercenary rule of rents?

5th. Again, while it is acknowledged as an objection to the Pew rent System, that the Rector is "a Minister of a class," of a "select few," and so is not able to act upon "the largeness of his commission as an ambassador of Christ," it is also maintained that this objection may be urged with greater force against Free Churches, some of which are "dependent mainly on a single man." We reply that there is a difference between the two Systems in this respect, which is radical, and which

re suppose our Author perceived, and therefore he is careful o avoid the mention of the Free Church System as liable to he objection. In the one case, the objection belongs to the ystem, grows out of it, and is inseparable from it, and no ew renting Church can exist at all, without subjecting the ector to that kind of degradation of office, which makes him the minister of a class." In the other case, the objection lies, ot against the System, but possibly against a few isolated ree Churches, and, simply and solely, because the System is ot fully carried out nor generally adopted. In the one case he evil must continue to increase, as the System increases. In he other case, there is a remedy in the System itself, and the nly remedy.

6th. Again says our Author:

"A Free Church must always guard itself against having too large a proportion f poor, lest it beggar itself by excluding those who are able to contribute. It annot open its doors, with perfect freedom, to the impoverished masses. Its Clergy annot go out into the highways and by-ways, and invite *all* to come in. It cannot, ven, always provide for the poor immediately around it, though they be not very numerous. Its first requisite is to retain a congregation that can support it; for his is its life. Then, what remains may be given to the poor. We have seen the xperiment made in a Free Church which stood upon the limit of a poor district. he Rector plunged into the mass of poverty and ignorance, and called upon the eople to come to Church. Many listened to the call. They began to frequent the louse of God. But the work was soon brought to a sudden end, by the discovery hat they were gradually displacing the old congregation, and so threatening the uin of the Parish. There was a necessary reaction."

Our reply to this objection will be comparatively brief. Can he Pew renting Church "open its doors with perfect freedom o the impoverished masses?" Can "its Clergy go out into he highways and by-ways and invite *all* to come in?" And f the Free Church can do more in this way than the Pew enting Church, as it confessedly can, then does it not come ust so much the nearer to the Primitive pattern, and does it ot act with just so much the more fidelity, upon the precepts f Christ our Lord? But granting all that the objector here ays to be true, is it an argument against the Free Church System, or against its general and universal adoption? Not t all. For, so far as it tells, it tells only as a difficulty and a discouragement in the way of isolated Free Church effort. How

much more indeed it can do in the way of opening the doors of the House of God to the masses of the people than Pew rented Churches, and yet what a load and burden it has to bear, simply in consequence of the prevailing fashionable monopoly.

Our Author is an advocate for the establishment of a few Free Churches, here and there, in particular localities, a kind of sprinkling of salt to keep the Church alive, but he denies the possibility of their general adoption in this country; and, yet all his arguments against the System, from beginning to end, are based upon the objections, difficulties and discouragements of the isolated Free Church, in the midst of a population of the poorest classes of the people, and dependent upon them for support. Possibly the Rector referred to in the story above, may have thought it practicable to establish a self-supporting Free Church in an alms house; but he has probably altered his mind, and would now go there with the rented Pew System. Possibly, too, he may have been the same Rector of whom we have heard the following story. Our Rector—we are not sure he is the same one—was very anxious to build a new Church in a more fashionable quarter, and, in order to secure the necessary funds, he proposed so far to change the System, as to sell every other Pew, and then by means of rents to sustain the services in the old building, as a Mission Chapel. To illustrate practically the necessity of such a movement, he, or an assistant employed by him, did indeed "plunge into the mass of poverty and ignorance," bringing into the Church a class of people, many of whom had to be fed and clothed; partly perhaps to pay them for coming to Church, and partly to enable them to come at all. The argument was a practical one, though it turned out financially a bad operation; and some persons were so uncharitable as to imagine that it was an indirect effort, not to build up the Free Church System, but rather to break it down. However it did not succeed, even in this respect, for the old Church still lives, and is still free.

7th. The last practical objection to the Free Church System, is derived from the uncertainty of the Offertory, and the ease with which a few disaffected persons may starve their Rector out of his living. Our first thought was, to reply to

objection simply by saying, that we had much rather be rved out under that System, than under the system of nted Pews, inasmuch as we should certainly have a clear science, and could therefore better endure the evils of pov- and starvation. But the subject is too important thus to passed over; and, besides, we feel under obligations of the pest gratitude to the Author of the Articles we are review-, for the plain and faithful manner in which he has sented the trials and exposures of the Clergy with reference their temporal support. We have no disposition whatsoever deny a single one of the facts he has stated. On the con-ry, we acknowledge that they may be true, even under the e Church System, as we have shown them to be true under System of rented seats. Under either System, as at pres- existing, wicked and worldly men may contrive to worry, ass, and finally "starve the Rector out," simply in conse-nce of the slightest "personal pique." But, in our judg-nt, the Rented Pew System is a thousand times worse, in t respect, than even the present isolated and defective Free urch effort, and for the following reasons: because there is thing in the System, which is calculated to awaken an "en-siastic love" for it, independently of personal considera-ns towards the particular minister who may chance to be the ctor; because the Rector is more in the power of the disaf-ted, not being able to let them go, and to gather around him ers more faithful and true; because the persons who are led upon to pay the rents, in many instances, are not the sons who really attend the services of the Church, or have y appreciation of its blessings; and, more than all, because re is a direct temptation to find fault with the Rector on ry occasion when the collector calls for the rent, inasmuch the sum to be paid is expressly for his support, and not all as an Offering to God, for the sake of Christ and His urch.

But what is the remedy? Undoubtedly the true remedy is e restoration of the Free Church System in all its parts; con-ntly, perpetually accumulating funds from every congrega-n and every individual, by never ceasing Free-will offerings

to God for all the purposes of the Church, and especially for the support of every faithful ambassador of Christ, making his support dependent, not upon his talents as a mere popular preacher, nor upon any of the casualities of time, but upon the fidelity with which he fulfills his appointed mission under constituted authorities; exorcising from the Church, as this System would do, almost insensibly, that peculiar demon, whose sway is so directly promoted by the bargains and financial considerations, with which the Clergy are now generally elected and sustained in their respective Parishes; and enabling the faithful to feel, as they can scarcely now feel with reference to any of the charitable institutions of the country, that what they give or bequeath is emphatically for Christ and His Church.

In this connection, may we not express our surprise and regret at the remark of our Author, in which he declares that "endowments will always be rare in this country." We cannot think so. In one of the Free Churches of this country, there was laid upon the altar, on the last Easter Day, the sum of twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars, as a free-will offering for the endowment of the Church; not the payment of a subscription for building a new Church, but for the support of the Clergy in the way of endowment. The moment we heard of it, we could not but exult in it, as "the first fruits" of the Free Church System. And we have no doubt, as the System becomes more and more extensively adopted, that this country will become, of all others, the land of charitable endowments and costly offerings upon the altar of God. Must it not be so? Undoubtedly it must, for the following reasons: 1st. That men of wealth are here unable to entail their estates. 2nd. That the only way in which they can "establish their houses upon earth," is by the consecration of their substance to purposes of piety and charity. 3d. That the only wand which can strike the rock and open the fountain of mercy in the human heart is, not the force and compulsion of necessity and Law, but the constraining power of the Love of Christ, the same power which operated upon the hearts of the early disciples, and constrained them to "count all things but loss for

the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." And 4th. That those endowments which shall be laid upon God's altar, in the name of Christ and for the benefit of His Church, will be the most sacred, lasting and secure. Who can doubt, then, as from time to time the question comes home to the hearts of our pious Laymen—what shall we do with our wealth? how shall we best employ it for the honor of God? where shall we place it to make it the most permanently useful to the world, and even to our own "kith and kin?" that the response will be clear and plain. You cannot entail it upon your families. You cannot make it permanent in the name of your children and children's children. You must seek a name that is indestructible and eternal; you must gather around it the guard and shield and protection of Almighty God; and the only way, in which you can do this, is by making a solemn consecration of it upon His altar, in the ever blessed and immortal name of Christ, and for the everlastingly benevolent purposes of His Church.

In this connection, may we not also say, that even the present isolated and defective Free Church System admits of great improvement, and we think the time is not far distant when a plan will be developed, by a convention of its friends, which will effectually protect the System from the possibility of the charge of "starving the Clergy out?"

But what does our Author propose, in the place of the only Scriptural, Primitive, Apostolic and Catholic Free Church System? At first blush, there is something startling and revolting in the very idea of a "substitute" for such a System. We should as soon think of a "substitute" of human device for the Bible and the Church; nor do we see why there is not just as much authority for the one as the other; nor why the demands of necessity may not be as strongly urged. However, our Author does defend, "as a substitute for the ancient economy, made necessary by the loss of the ancient discipline," the Pew renting System. We have already quoted the strong language in which he condemns the selling of Pews in buildings consecrated to the Service and Worship of Almighty God. But he maintains that, between the selling and the renting, there is an

"essential and radical difference in principle." The one violates, grossly and palpably, the principle of consecration. The other does not affect it, the property remaining sacred and belonging to God from the hour of its consecration. The one "is the conferring of ownership." The other is only "a permission for temporary use, on condition of contributing so much to the support of the Sanctuary." "And that is the point of difference, on which we insist;" in the one case a man is owner, and in the other he is not.

No doubt some persons did really suppose, that our Author had made out an actual and important difference in principle between the Pew selling and renting Systems; for the confidence with which he argues the point was well calculated to deceive, and it is probable that he was himself deluded by his own words. But since the able exposition of that folly by "The Church Journal," we are rather inclined to think that the delusion has been dissipated from his own mind, as it certainly has been from the minds of others.*

But in addition, we have a few words to say. Possibly we may be wrong, but we appeal to the legal profession. Why is it that "the selling of Pews in consecrated buildings is monstrous, abominable, sacrilegious?" Our Author replies, because "they are therefore property, man's property;" and then he asks, "Is not the making of it or of any part of it human property, a worldly use." Now we deny, in toto, that our Author has discovered the true grounds and reasons of his own condemnation of the Pew selling System. For, if his argument proves anything, it proves too much; it proves that not even "the Vestry" can own the Church as property, without the crime of sacrilege. True, indeed, he attempts to excuse this ownership by "the Vestry," by saying "the Vestry is the Steward in God's behalf." But why the Vestry more than the Pew owner? We maintain that, under our laws, not as much; for the Pew owner cannot dispose of his Pew for any but a sacred use, nor use it except for Worship; whereas the Vestry

* We refer our readers to the Article in The Journal, entitled "Pews and the Church Review," Vol. VIII. p. 204.

can sell the whole house and the land on which it is built, for a Rail Road Depot or for a Theatre. The truth is, that "the Vestry" hold only a qualified property in the Church; so with the Pew owner, he has only a qualified property in the Pew; and so with the Lessee, he has a qualified property: the interest of each in the eye of the law is property, and a lease is just as much property as is a conditional or qualified fee, just as much property as is absolute ownership. According to law, the Vestry, the Pew owner, the Pew renter, each and all have a property in the Church, and the nature, the extent, the quality of the property, in all these cases, depend upon the terms of the deed or lease under which they hold. In fact there must be human ownership of some kind, in Church buildings and property, and what we maintain is this: that whether the human owner be a Corporation aggregate, or a Corporation sole, a Vestry, an individual person owning the whole Church property, or a Pew owner or a Pew renter, nevertheless the human owner is always God's steward, and is guilty of sin if he perverts the trust. And, moreover, we maintain that there can be no greater perversion of the trust of a consecrated Church building, no matter who may be the human owner, than to close its doors against any individual of the great family of God, who may desire to worship in His House of Prayer. Our argument is one, which addresses itself not to Vestries and Corporations only, which have no souls, but to every individual member of the Church, who dares to imagine for a moment that he has any exclusive right to the privileges and the blessings of the House of God. Every such individual, no matter what may be the terms of his human lease or title deeds, is bound, as the steward of God, to make the consecrated Temple free; and so to sustain, protect and defend it, as that it may never be alienated from the objects of its consecration, and never monopolized. We would also warn all such individuals of the crime of sacrilege; not because they may chance to be human owners of consecrated Church property, but because the very essence of that crime, as defined in every exposition of law, is, "the appropriating to one's self what is devoted to religion and to God."

But our Author, having shown, as he imagines, that the Pew renting System is entirely consistent with the principle of consecration, then proceeds to mention a number of improvements, by which the System may be made more tolerable and efficient. We have been not a little amused by these suggestions. He proposes, in the first place, that "the holders of Pews be invited to authorize the Sexton to fill the seats in their Pews which they do not themselves occupy." Of course nothing more is necessary than simply to "invite the holders of Pews" to give such authority, no "law or compulsion" here, and then the Sexton can go out into the highways and hedges, proclaim his authority, assure the people that no questions will be asked, nor will they have anything to pay, no alms, no oblations, no offerings, all is paid for by their richer friends. Free passes are offered, and nothing is wanting but the "dead heads" to fill up the seats. Very practicable! May we not suggest that the Wardens and Vestry also should stand at the door of the Church, not the Sexton alone, to wait upon strangers to a seat? We make this suggestion in good faith, because we have known it to be done in one of the best Pew renting and selling Churches of the country, and it would certainly be a great improvement, and perhaps the only act of genuine hospitality of which the System is capable.

But our Author recommends, "secondly, that all seats be regarded as free, which are not occupied when the reading of the Psalms begins;" and, moreover, he thinks that this would "correct another vicious practice of many Pew congregations, viz.: coming to Church late," a practice which he acknowledges is not so prevalent in Free Churches. Admirable suggestion! Not the Free System out and out, but enough of it if possible "to correct another vicious practice." No doubt the vestibule and aisles would be full of people, standing ready to take the unoccupied seats, the moment "the reading of the Psalms begins." But we advise a little different course, and that is, an immediate appeal to law; for as we understand, the law now "regards all seats as free," not occupied at the very commencement of the Services, and our Author may at once try his own favorite remedy for the enforcement of one of his own favorite plans of improvement.

Then he proposes, "thirdly, where a family has an unoccu-
d seat in its Pew, that some respectable poor person be
ited to take it." Excellent suggestion! but the person
st be "respectable;" by what standard of respectability is
stated, but probably the standard in vogue in the congre-
ion; not certainly the standard which brought our Saviour
n to earth, and caused Him to die for sinners. And then,
rder to encourage the advocates of the Pew renting System
this great improvement, our Author makes another extract
m his own experience; he says: "We happen to know of
, we are sorry we know of only one, beautiful example of
s kind. A family of great wealth in one of our northern
es, having a superfluous seat, found a poor woman, one de-
dent wholly upon charity, but of good character, and gave
place to her." And then, besides giving her the "super-
ous seat," this very charitable family of great wealth, also
vide "the apparel in which she comes to Church," so as to
e her look respectable, and, "moreover, provide for her wants
home." What a wonderful illustration of the charity of the
renting System, and how very encouraging! But what
s our Author mean? Is he writing a burlesque upon his
orite System, or is he in sober earnest? We have really
ught sometimes that his designs have been mistaken, and
should not be surprised if such should be the fact.

But the greatest improvement which our author proposes,
l that upon which he lays the most stress in order to remedy
defects of the Pew renting system, is, "Mission Churches
Chapels, as connected with the treatment of the poor by
Churches." He seems to think that this is a *novel* feature
the age, full of promise; and he is "disposed to claim for
larger and fuller preaching of the Gospel to the poor than
or can be attained by any Free Church." Now we confess
regret, at not being able to agree with our author, *even*
n this point; but really he does appear to us like a person
o has been in a sort of Rip Van Winkle condition for the
forty years. Mission Churches, or Chapels for the poor, a
ovel" idea, of "recent date," a "feature of the age," "grow-
into importance!" Why, we should as soon think of

speaking of the old system of stage-coaches as a "novel" idea, just growing into importance. The truth is, that the whole Free Church movement, in this country, owes its origin to the utter and entire failure of this novelty in Christendom. We have found out from actual experience that rich Churches for the rich, and poor Churches for the poor, will not do, and can never reach the masses of the people. You may build your Mission Churches or Chapels for the poor, in any street of the city; but you can no more get the poor to go into them by themselves, to hear the Gospel and worship God, than you can get them to go into a dungeon or jump into the river, for the same purpose. Indeed, the grand obstacle, with which isolated Free Churches now have to contend, is the stigma that they are designed merely for the poor; and it almost makes our blood boil, when we hear them advocated upon that ground. For it is not the true ground—on the contrary, their very object and designs are, to break down all such distinctions in the House of God, and to place all mankind upon one common level, as "miserable sinners," at the footstool of Infinite Mercy. We confess that we have no sympathy with Mission Churches for the poor, to be supported by Pew rented Churches for the rich; and we rejoice that the poor cannot be prevailed upon to go into them. We rejoice that, notwithstanding their poverty and degradation, they have some manliness left, and some sense of right and wrong, and therefore will not submit to a system so un-scriptural and un-catholic, not to say revolting to any Christian heart. We honor the feeling, not because the condition of Lazarus is more degraded in the sight of God than that of Dives, but because, to wring from the human heart a confession of its poverty, on the blessed Lord's Day, and to make that poverty a condition of worship in a special place, is more than human nature ought to bear, and constitutes a kind of Protestant confessional, more odious and abominable than any thing which ever debased the Roman Church.

But we come to another stronghold of the author of the Articles we are reviewing, and we quote his own words.

"Most of the Pew Churches of which we speak are so situated that they cannot have, if they would, any considerable number of poor in them. They are too far

removed from the abodes of the poor to admit of such a possibility." .... "In many Pew Churches, especially in those which are likely to undertake Missions, there is no occasion, it were useless, to provide numerous places for the poor; since the Churches are situated where the poor are not, and where they cannot be induced to come. We say again, (and the position requires no argument,) to bless the poor, you must go where they are congregated; in vast districts apart by themselves." .... "The idea of combining rich and poor generally in the same congregation, is simply impracticable, for the very plain reason that they do not live together. It is a necessity that some congregations be composed mainly of rich people, because the neighborhood of the Church furnishes no other. If this is an evil, it is one which springs from our civil condition, and therefore is one which the Church cannot control."

Now all this is an argument for rich Churches for the rich, and poor Churches for the poor, confessedly based, not upon any principle, but upon the necessities of the case, over which "the Church has no control," and, in consequence of which, she is to act as "honestly and as faithfully as the times will admit." God be praised, we have not yet fallen to the same level of the times, in our thoughts, feelings and sentiments upon this subject; nor do we believe that such is the level of the great body of Churchmen. On the contrary, we take our stand upon some point of elevation, lifted up above the cities and looking down upon them all; and to us, the spectacle of the location of the Churches, principally in fashionable quarters, is most painful and distressing, throwing a flood of light upon the motives of their erection, and convincing us, not that the Church has no control over this great, gigantic, civil and social evil, but that she has control, and is responsible for it, and must apply the remedy. Standing upon this point of elevation, we see and acknowledge the fact stated by our Author, that these Churches are located, "where the poor are not, and where they cannot be induced to come"—not where they ought to be located and are most required by the wants and necessities of the population; not in those "vast districts" where the masses of the people "most do congregate," and where there is little or nothing but moral and spiritual darkness, desolation and death; but principally and almost entirely among the palaces of the rich and great, and under circumstances which show, that they have been erected more to adorn the buildings and streets, and with reference to the payment of Pew rents, than for the glory of God in the salvation of man. And although

it is a beautiful sight on a Sunday morning, when the orb of day shines gloriously out, to see the multitudes coming from their costly dwellings and thronging these Churches, yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that immense numbers of these very people have no sympathies in common with the self-denying doctrines of the Cross; and that there is a dark and fearful back-ground to the picture, containing its thousands of perishing outcasts, who have no idea that Christ died for them, and who are congregated at a distance of a few hundred yards only, in stores, and shops, and saloons, and alleys, and dens, and caves, as regardless of the Church-going bell, as if its sound had never fallen upon their ears. O, we wonder not, when we consider the location of our Churches alone, that the members of all this forsaken class should feel, as one of them said, that "Religion is not for the likes of us; it is for the great and rich people;" and hence the fact that the Church has lost her hold upon their sympathies and hearts. No doubt there are hundreds and thousands in every city, going down to the chambers of eternal death, with the feeling inwrought into every fibre of their souls, that "Religion is not for the likes of us; it is for the great and rich people." And how many "great and rich people" are there, living under a delusion equally ruinous, not that they are sinners in common with "the publicans and harlots," and therefore dependent for salvation upon God's unmerited Mercy, but that "Religion *is* for the likes" of them, and that, in consequence of the payment of the pecuniary expenses of Worship, they are, justly and rightfully, the monopolizers of the blessings of the Gospel.

Let no one understand us as objecting to the location of our Churches in the most commanding positions, to accomplish all the great objects of their mission; but we are free to confess, that the crowding of our elegant Churches upon fashionable streets, by all the denominations, and the strife for situations to accommodate the rich, who are so much better able generally to go a long distance than the poor, was among the facts which first awakened our attention to the enormous evils of the Pew renting System; and instead of operating upon our mind, as it has upon the mind of our Author, we came to conclusions

directly the reverse. We knew indeed, and we felt indeed, that in order "to bless the poor, we must go where they are congregated;" and then we thought what an infinite blessing, civilly, socially and spiritually would it be, as well to the rich as the poor, if some of these elegant Churches could be placed in localities accessible to all. What an elevation of the poor and of "the vast districts" in which they congregate; and what a beautiful illustration of condescension on the part of the rich; destroying the envy of the one and the pride of the other, and binding all together, as members of "one family and household of faith." Can it not be so? Must it not be so? Our Author says, No! The thing is impossible from the very necessities of the case. The rich live together, and therefore there must be Churches for the rich. The poor live together, and therefore there must be Churches for the poor. The rich Churches cannot be free, because the rich will not support them unless compelled by Pew rents. The poor Churches must be free, because the poor are unable to support them if they would. All this he acknowledges to be wrong—at least not Scriptural, not Apostolic, not Catholic, not in accordance with the "spirit of Christianity;" but necessity makes it imperative, and we must be governed by the stern dictates of necessity. Upon this ground alone does he defend the Pew renting System. Upon this ground alone does he base the whole argument for Mission Churches for the poor. By this rule alone does he propose that the Church shall be governed, in her efforts for the salvation of fallen man. But God forbid, that we should act upon such a principle, either in morals or religion. For we know not any crime, which may not be defended by the necessities of the case. We know not any virtue, which men may not refuse to practise in consequence of what may appear to them the stern dictates of necessity. And more than all, we recognize in this principle of action, the very essence of that horrible, atheistic fatality, which destroys all trust in God, all reliance upon His promises, and all ventures of faith; and which brings upon the soul the darkness and the hopelessness of despair.

But, wherein does our Author place the necessities of the

case? Not in the Word of God; not in the decrees of Heaven; not in the laws of nature; but, simply, and solely, in the difficulty, and fancied impossibility, of raising funds for the support of the clergy, arising out of a certain state of society, existing "in this country," and no where else in Christendom. O, we are pained; we are deeply pained as Churchmen,—and as Americans,—that the perpetuation of an acknowledged "evil" should be advocated upon such a ground! And we sincerely hope, that the next Clerical advocate of the same "evil" will at least forget himself, and "the loaves and fishes," for the sake of Christ and His Church, and will not fall into the prevailing error of our Author, running through the whole of his Articles —the error of imagining that the sole and only object of the Church's existence is to support the clergy.

But, no matter wherein the necessities of the case consist, we proclaim, without fear of contradiction, that it never can be necessary for the Church of God, however she may adapt herself to circumstances, to pursue a course of action, which is confessedly hostile to the spirit of the Gospel, and in violation of Primitive, Apostolic and Catholic usage and authority.

In conclusion, we exhort the advocates of the Free Church System not to be intimidated, alarmed or discouraged. For a glorious prospect is before us. The skies begin to brighten. That great barrier, which has so long separated the Church from the people, and which has made her, in their estimation, a cold hearted and unsympathetic Society, is tottering to its fall. We want no better evidence than such a defence of it as we have now examined, and the sophistries of which we have exposed; and although individuals, here and there, may be called upon to suffer, yet we should all rejoice that we can suffer in such a cause—"pro Deo et Ecclesia."

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.*

JOURNAL

OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY AND LAITY,

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

IN A

CONVENTION,

HELD IN

The City of Philadelphia, from Tuesday, June 11th, to Wednesday, June 19th, 1799.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

From the State of Massachusetts.—Rev. William Walter, D. D.

From the State of Rhode Island.—Rev. Abraham Lynsen Clarke.

From the State of Connecticut.—Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, Benjamin Hall, Esquire.

From the State of New York.—Rev. John Bisset, Rev. Ammi Rogers.

From the State of New Jersey.—Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., Rev. Henry Waddell, Rev. John Croes, Rev. Menzies Rayner, John Rutherford, Esquire, Mr. Jeffery Clarke, Mr. John Dennis.

From the State of Pennsylvania.—Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rev. John Andrews, D. D., Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D., Rev. Robert Blackwell, D. D., General Francis Gurney, John C. Stocker, Esquire, Mr. Joseph Sims, Mr. J. B. Gilpin.

From the State of Delaware.—Rev. Robert Clay, Rev. Joseph Clarkson, Rev. William Pryce, Rev. Walter C. Gardiner, Joseph Burn, Esquire.

From the State of Virginia.—Rev. John Bracken, D. D., Robert Andrews, Esquire.

* Continued from Vol. XIII, p. 317.

JOURNAL

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

PHILADELPHIA, CHRIST CHURCH, *Tuesday, June 11th*, 1799.

A SUFFICIENT number of Clerical and Lay Deputies to form a Convention not appearing, the members present adjourned to meet at the State House, to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

STATE HOUSE, *Wednesday, June* 12.

The members met agreeably to adjournment, and a quorum being formed,

The Right Rev. Dr. White read prayers.

Deputies from seven states appearing, the house proceeded to the appointment, by ballot, of a President, and a majority of votes were found for the Rev. William Smith, D. D.

The Rev. James Abercrombie, one of the assistant ministers of Christ Church and St. Peter's, was appointed Secretary to the Convention.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Andrews inform the house of Bishops, that the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies is formed, and ready to proceed to business.

Resolved, That the rules of order established by the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, of the two preceding General Conventions, be adopted.

The Rev. William Walter, D. D., clerical deputy from the State of Massachusetts; the Rev. Abraham Lynsen Clarke, clerical deputy from the State of Rhode Island; the Rev. John Bisset, and the Rev. Ammi Rogers, clerical deputies from the State of New York; the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., the Rev. Henry Waddell, and the Rev. John Croes, clerical deputies, and Mr. Jeffery Clarke, lay deputy, from the State of New Jersey; Rev. William Smith, D. D., the Rev. John Andrews, D. D,, the Rev. Samuel Magaw, D. D., and the Rev. Robert Blackwell, D. D., clerical deputies, General Francis Gurney, and Mr. Joseph Sims, lay deputies, from the State of Pennsylvania; the Rev. Joseph Clarkson, the Rev. William Pryce, and the Rev. Walter C. Gardiner, clerical deputies, and Joseph Burn, Esquire, lay deputy, from the state of Delaware; and the Rev. John Bracken, D. D., clerical deputy, and Robert Andrews, Esquire, lay deputy from the State

of Virginia; delivered in at the Secretary's table, certificates of their appointment, which were read, and determined to be satisfactory.

Mr. Bisset proposed the following resolution, viz; "That a committee consisting of members, be appointed to revise the canons, to propose amendments, and report the whole in one regular series." This resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table.

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY, *June 13th.*

Prayers being read by the Secretary, the house proceeded to business.

The Rev. William Smith, D. D., and the Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, clerical deputies, and Benjamin Hall, Esquire, lay deputy, from the State of Connecticut, presented their testimonials, which were approved, and they took their seats accordingly. Mr. John Dennis, a lay deputy from the State of New Jersey, and John C. Stocker, Esquire, a lay deputy, from the State of Pennsylvania, took their seats.

Mr. Bisset's proposed resolution of yesterday, was taken up, and carried, and the blank ordered to be filled up with the word "five."

The members appointed were Rev. Dr. Smith, of Connecticut, Rev. Mr. Bisset, of New York, Rev. Mr. Waddell, of New Jersey, Gen. Gurney, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Hall, of Connecticut.

The house resolved itself into a committee of the whole, on the state of the Church:

The Rev. Dr. Walter in the chair.

After some time the committee rose, and the chairman reported the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, That the consideration of the resolution, for an alteration in the constitution of this Church, proposed in the last General Convention, in these words: "But if the Church shall not be represented in both orders, by a majority of the states, then the votes shall be given by states, without regard to orders," be postponed to the next General Convention.

This resolution was disagreed to by the House.

Resolved, That this House will now go into a committee of the whole, to take into consideration the second resolution of the General Convention of Friday, Sept, 18, 1795, and to report thereon.

The house resolved itself accordingly, Dr. Walter in the chair.

The chairman of the committee of the whole reported, that the committee had risen, and requested leave to sit again.

Resolved, That in the places of Dr. Moore and Mr. Bend, who are

absent, Dr. Smith of Connecticut, and Mr. Bisset, be added to the other three members, viz: Dr. Smith of Pennsylvania, Dr. Andrews, and Dr. Magaw, the committee appointed by the last General Convention to digest and report a course of study for candidates for holy orders, and that they be requested to report the same during the present session.

Resolved, That Dr. Andrews and Mr. Andrews be a committee, to bring in a canon prescribing the mode of calling special meetings of the General Convention.

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to officiate as Chaplain to the Convention during the present session.

Adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *June 14th.*

The House met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

The Rev. Menzies Rayner, a clerical deputy from the State of New Jersey, and the Rev. Robert Clay, a clerical deputy from the State of Delaware, took their seats.

Mr. Andrews, from the committee appointed to report a canon for calling special Conventions, reported a canon, prescribing the mode of calling special Conventions; which was read the first time, and ordered for a second reading.

On motion, the canon prescribing the mode of calling special Conventions, was read a second time, amended, and ordered to be fairly transcribed for a third reading: it was then passed, and sent for concurrence, by the Secretary, to the house of Bishops.

Mr. Croes presented testimonials from the State Convention of New Jersey, recommending the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., as Bishop of that State.

Ordered to lie on the table.

On motion of Mr. Baldwin, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, to take into consideration the propriety of framing articles of religion. Dr. Walter in the chair.

The chairman of the committee reported the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, That the articles of our faith and religion, as founded on the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, are sufficiently declared in our creeds and liturgy, as set forth in the book of common prayer established for the use of this church; and that further articles do not appear necessary.

This resolution was disagreed to by the House.

The house of Bishops, sent for concurrence a form of consecration of a church or chapel, which was ordered to lie on the table.

The Rev. Mr. Clarkson asked leave of absence till Tuesday, which was not granted.

Adjourned to 6 o'clock this evening.

FRIDAY EVENING, 6 *o'clock.*

The House met.

The canon, prescribing the mode of calling special Conventions was returned with amendments from the house of Bishops, which were agreed to.

The form of consecration of a church or chapel, sent to this House by the Bishops, was read, and referred to a committee of the whole house to-morrow morning.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the testimonials, respecting the Bishop elect of New Jersey, be read, which was done.

Resolved, That the consideration of this subject be postponed till to-morrow.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

SATURDAY, *June 15th.*

The House met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the testimonials in favour of the Bishop elect of New Jersey, and, after discussion, the subject was postponed.

A resolution was proposed by Mr. Bisset, that the Convention now proceed to the framing of articles of religion for this church.

The question was taken by yeas and nays as follows:

CLERGY.—Massachusetts—No. Connecticut—Yea. Rhode Island—Yea. New York—Yea. New Jersey—Yea. Pennsylvania—No. Delaware—Yea. Virginia—No.

LAITY.—Connecticut—Yea. New Jersey—Yea. Pennsylvania—Yea. Virginia—No.

So it was carried in the affirmative.

Resolved, That the committee shall consist of a member from each state now represented; who were chosen, and were as follows:

Massachusetts, Dr. Walter; Connecticut, Dr. Smith; New York, Mr. Bisset; New Jersey, Mr. Waddell; Pennsylvania, Dr. Andrews; Delaware, Mr. Clay; Virginia, Dr. Bracken.

Resolved, That leave be given to Mr. Baldwin to bring in a canon, to regulate the qualifications of ministers to vote in State and General Conventions.

A message was received from the house of Bishops, communicating "a resolution for altering the 1st article of the constitution;" and "a proposal of a prayer, to be used at the meetings of the Conventions."

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, to take into consideration the communications from the house of Bishops. Dr. Walter in the chair.

The committee rose, and reported certain amendments in the "Form of consecration of a church, or chapel;" also, amendments to the "resolution, for the time of meeting of future General Conventions;" together with an amendment to the "prayer, to be used during the sitting of Convention:" all which were concurred in by the House.

Resolved, That leave be given to Mr. Andrews to bring in a canon, respecting the consecration of Bishops in the recess of the General Convention; which was presented, read, and ordered to lie on the table.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock on Monday morning.

MONDAY MORNING, *June 17th.*

The House met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

Mr. Baldwin presented "a canon, to regulate the qualifications of ministers to vote in State and General Conventions;" which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The proposed "canon, respecting the consecration of Bishops in the recess of the Convention," was read a second time, amended, and ordered to be sent to the house of Bishops.

The communications from the house of Bishops, with the amendments proposed by the house of Clerical and Lay Deputies, were returned by the house of Bishops, with their concurrence.

The chairman of the committee, for revising and amending the canons, made a report; which was read, and ordered to be recommitted.

At 11 o'clock, the House adjourned for two hours, in order that the several committees might finish their reports.

MONDAY, 1 *o'clock, P. M.*

The House met.

Mr. Andrews solicited leave to bring in a canon, repealing in part the canon of 1795, "concerning the learning of those who are to be ordained:" which was granted; and the canon was read, approved, and sent for concurrence to the house of Bishops.

On motion of Mr. Bisset, *Resolved*, That the committee, appointed

to review and arrange the canons, be discharged; and that all the canons which have been passed in preceding General Conventions, together with those which may be passed during the present session, shall be arranged under the respective years in which they were enacted, and printed at the end of the Journal of this Convention. Provided, nevertheless, that, if any canon of the preceding Conventions has been repealed, it shall be mentioned by its number and title only, followed by a notification of its having been repealed.

A motion was made by Mr. Bisset, that it be made known to the several State Conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine in the next General Convention, on the following addition to the second article of the constitution, to be introduced in the 9th line, after the word "Convention," viz:

"But if the church shall not be represented in both orders, in a majority of the states, then the votes shall be by states, without regard to orders."

The previous question, "Shall the main question be put?" was taken, and determined in the negative.

John Rutherford, Esquire, Lay Deputy from the State of New Jersey, took his seat.

On motion of Mr. Croes, the recommendation of the church in New Jersey, in favour of their Bishop elect, was taken up; and, after some discussion, it was *Resolved*, That the consideration of the same be postponed till to-morrow.

The House of Bishops returned the canon, repealing in part the canon of 1795, "concerning the learning of those who are to be ordained," with their approbation; and "a substitute for the canon, respecting the consecration of Bishops during the recess of the General Convention," which was adopted.

Adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

TUESDAY MORNING, *June 18th.*

The House met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

The proposed canon, respecting the qualification of ministers to vote in State and General Conventions, was read, amended, and ordered to be sent for concurrence to the House of Bishops; which was done.

Mr. J. B. Gilpin, a Lay Deputy, from the State of Pennsylvania, took his seat.

The chairman, of the committee on the articles, reported seventeen

articles of religion, which were read: Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Bisset,

Resolved unanimously, That, on account of the advanced period of the present session, and the thinness of the Convention, the consideration of the articles, now reported and read, be postponed; and that the Secretary transcribe the articles into the Journal of this Convention, to lie over for the consideration of the next General Convention.

Dr. Bracken asked leave to bring in a canon, supplementary to the 2d canon of 1795, "concerning the testimonials to be produced on the part of those who are to be ordained;" which was read twice, and, upon the question for the third reading, was negatived.

The testimonials of the Bishop elect of New Jersey being called up, the following resolution passed:

"Whereas doubts have arisen in the minds of some members of the Convention, whether all the Priests who voted in the election of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., to the office of a Bishop in the state of New Jersey, were so qualified, as to constitute them a majority of the resident and officiating Priests, in the said state, according to the meaning of the canon in this case made and provided: and whereas, in a matter of so great importance to the interest of religion and the honour of our church, it is not only necessary, that they, who concur in recommending to an office so very sacred, should have a full conviction of the fitness of the person they recommend, but that they should also be perfectly satisfied with respect to the regularity of every step which had been taken in the business:

Resolved therefore, That in the opinion of the House of Deputies, all proceedings, respecting the consecration of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., ought to be suspended, until a future Convention of the State of New Jersey shall declare their sense of the subject."

The house of Bishops returned the canon; "to regulate the qualifications of Ministers, &c." with amendments. The amended title was adopted; the other proposed amendment was rejected.

The house of Bishops receded from their amendment of the canon, explanatory of the 1st canon of 1795.

Resolved, That the next general Convention, to be held agreeably to the constitution, on the second Tuesday of September, 1801, shall meet in the city of Trenton.

Resolved, That the Right Rev. Dr. White be requested to preach, at the opening of the next General Convention.

Resolved, That the house of Bishops be informed, that this House is ready to adjourn.

Mr. Bisset was requested to communicate the two preceding resolves to the house of Bishops.

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be given to their President, the Rev. Dr. Smith, and to their Secretary and Chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Abercrombie, for their attention and services.

Mr. Bisset reported, "That the Right Rev. Dr. White would comply with the request of this house, and that the house of Bishops, having no further communications to make, concurred in the resolution of adjournment."

Ordered, That five hundred and seventy copies of the journal be printed.

The House adjourned, *sine die*.

Signed by order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, President.

JAMES ABERCROMBIE, Secretary.

APPENDIX.

Extract from the Journal of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in Convention met, 1799.

"*Resolved unanimously*, That on account of the advanced period of the present session, and the thinness of the Convention, the consideration of the articles, now reported and read, be postponed, and that the Secretary transcribe the articles into the journal of this Convention, to lie over for the consideration of the next General Convention."

The articles referred to are as follows.

I. *Of faith in the Holy Trinity.*

There is but one living and true God, everlasting; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible. And in the unity of this Godhead, there are three persons; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier.

II. *Of the Holy Scripture.*

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, and cannot be proved thereby, is not to be received as an article of faith, nor deemed necessary to salvation.

By Holy Scripture, we understand the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.

The names and number of the canonical books in the Old Testament.

	CHAPTERS.		CHAPTERS.
1. Genesis having	50	21. Ecclesiastes having	12
2. Exodus	40	22. The Song of Solomon	8
3. Leviticus	27	23. Isaiah	66
4. Numbers	36	24. Jeremiah	52
5. Deuteronomy	34	25. Lamentations	5
6. Joshua	24	26. Ezekiel	48
7. Judges	21	27. Daniel	12
8. Ruth	4	28. Hosea	14
9. The 1st book of Samuel	31	29. Joel	3
10. The 2d book of Samuel	24	30. Amos	9
11. The 1st book of Kings	22	31. Obadiah	1
12. The 2d book of Kings	25	32. Jonah	4
13. The 1st book of Chronicles	29	33. Micah	7
14. The 2d book of Chronicles	36	34. Nahum	3
15. Ezra	10	35. Habakuk	3
16. Nehemiah	13	36. Zephaniah	3
17. The book of Esther	10	37. Haggai	2
18. The book of Job	42	38. Zechariah	14
19. The Psalms	150	39. Malachi	4
20. The Proverbs	31		

The names and number of the canonical books of the New Testament.

	CHAPTERS.		CHAPTERS.
1. St. Matthew having	28	15. 1st Epistle to Timothy having	6
2. St. Mark	16	16. 2d Epistle to Timothy	4
3. St. Luke	24	17. Epistle to Titus	3
4. St. John	21	18. Epistle to Philemon	1
5. The Acts of the Apostles	28	19. Epistle to the Hebrews	13
6. Epistle to the Romans	16	20. Epistle of St. James	5
7. 1st Epistle to the Corinthians	16	21. 1st Epistle of St. Peter	5
8. 2d Epistle to the Corinthians	13	22. 2d Epistle of St. Peter	3
9. Epistle to the Galatians	5	23. 1st Epistle of St. John	5
10. Epistle to the Ephesians	6	24. 2d Epistle of St. John	1
11. Epistle to the Philipians	4	25. 3d Epistle of St. John	1
12. Epistle to the Colossians	4	26. Epistle of St. Jude	1
13. 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians	5	27. Revelation of St. John the Divine	22
14. 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians	3		

The Apocryphal books are read by the church, for example of life, and instruction of manners, not for the establishment of discipline, or doctrine.

III. *Of the Old and New Testament.*

There is a perfect harmony and accordance between the Old and New Testament; for in both, "Pardon of sin and everlasting life are offered to mankind through Christ, Who is the only mediator between God and man;" and although Christians are not bound to obey the civil and ceremonial precepts, yet they are obliged to observe all the moral commandments of the Mosaic dispensation.

IV. *Of the Creeds.*

The Nicene creed and the Apostles' creed, ought to be retained and ılieved; because every article contained in them may be proved by ıly Scripture.

V. *Of the transgression of our first parents.*

By the transgression of our first parents, they lost that primitive nocence and perfect holiness in which God had created them; and ıus the nature of man became corrupted, and prone to evil; so that ıere is no man living, who sinneth not.

VI. *Of Justification.*

We are justified, or pardoned by God, not on account of our own ood works, but only through the merits and mediation of our blessed deemer and advocate, Jesus Christ. But although good works can- ot put away our sins, nor appear perfect before God; yet they are leasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and essentially necessary to alvation; for scripture assures us, that "faith, without works, is ead;" and that, "without holiness, no man shall see the Lord."

VII. *Of Predestination and Election.*

Being well assured, from holy scripture, of the eternal purpose or romise of redemption, according to which, God sent his Son to be he propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and Christ Jesus gave imself a ransom for all; we receive the doctrine of predestination as onsistent with, and agreeable to, this most gracious and general cheme of salvation, which we believe to be universal in the intention, owever partial the wickedness of mankind may render it in the ap- lication. Under the impression of this belief, it is the duty of hristians to be satisfied with, and attend to, the promises of God, as hey are generally set forth to us in holy scripture, without seeking to e "wise above what is written," or plunging into the unrevealed ecrets of either past or future eternity, but always remembering the listinction which in such cases, Moses lays down: "Secret things be- ong unto the Lord our God; but the things which are revealed belong nto us, and to our children for ever; that we may do all the words f this law."

VIII. *Of salvation by Christ alone.*

Holy scripture declares, that "there is none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but only the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." But we are not authorized to as- sert, that men shall not be saved by the name of Jesus Christ, to

whom His gospel has not been promulgated. We leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

IX. *Of the Church.*

The visible church of Christ is the whole multitude of believers, of whatsoever nation or language, dwelling on the face of the earth, among whom the pure word of God is preached, the sacraments duly administered, and the order of the priesthood observed, according to Christ's ordinance and appointment.

X. *Of the authority of the Church.*

The church hath power to ordain, change, and abolish, rites and ceremonies, and to determine controversies of faith; but it is not lawful for the church, to ordain or command anything to be received or believed, which is contrary to the canon of scripture; or to expound one part of the same, so as to be repugnant to another. The church, also, is the witness, or keeper of holy writ; and must neither adulterate, nor add to, nor take from, the same.

XI. *Of ministering in the Church.*

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or administering the holy sacraments, until he be regularly ordained, and sent to execute the same. And those we judge lawfully sent, who are ordained by the Bishops of the church.

XII. *Of the Sacraments.*

Sacraments were ordained by Christ, not only to be badges or tokens of christian profession, but to be outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace; by which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm, our faith in him.

XIII. *Of Baptism.*

Baptism is an ordinance by which we are regenerated, and born again of water and the Holy Ghost, received into Christ's church, and made living members of the same.

XIV. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

The Supper of the Lord is not only a token of the love that christians ought to have towards one another, but rather a pledge of our redemption by Christ's death. To such as worthily receive the same, the bread which is broken is a partaking of the body of Christ: and the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ; both which

are spiritually received, for the preservation of our souls and bodies unto everlasting life.

XV. *Of the oblation of Christ.*

The oblation of the body of Christ, once made, is that perfect sacrifice, propitiation, and satisfaction, which was offered for the sins of the whole world. And there is no other sacrifice, satisfaction, or atonement, for sin, but that only.

XVI. *Of excommunicated Persons.*

Whosoever is publicly excommunicated by the governors of the church, and cut off from the unity of the same, is to be considered as an alien from the promises of the gospel, until he be openly reconciled, and received again into communion.

XVII. *Of the power of the Civil Magistrate.*

The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the gospel, to pay a respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

PHILADELPHIA, CHRIST CHURCH, *Tuesday, June 11th*, 1799.

THIS being the day of a special meeting of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church duly summoned, the Right Rev. Bishop White, of the House of Bishops, attended, and appointed to meet the next day at 10 o'clock, in the committee room of the House of Assembly; leave having been given to meet there, by his excellency the Governor.

WEDNESDAY, *June* 12, 1799.

In the committee room of the House of Assembly,

Present as before, together with the Right Rev. Bishop Provoost, of the state of New York, and the Right Rev. Bishop Bass, of the state of Massachusetts.

This being a special meeting, and the Bishop, whose turn it would have been to preside agreeably to the rules of this House, not attending, Bishop White, the president of the last Convention, was requested to preside.

Resolved, That during the session of the Convention, the House will attend divine service in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The House received a message, by the Rev. Dr. Andrews, from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, informing, that they are organized and ready to proceed to business. This House declared, that they also are ready to proceed.

After some time, the House adjourned until to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

THURSDAY, *June* 13.

The House met. Present as yesterday.

The Rev. John Henry Hobart was appointed Secretary.

The Right Rev. Bishop Provoost proposed to the consideration of this House, a form of consecration of a church or chapel, which was read, and made the order of the day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *June* 14.

The House met. Present as yesterday.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies presented, by their Secretary a proposed canon, prescribing the mode of calling special meetings of the General Convention.

The House went into the consideration of the "form of consecration of a church or chapel;" which, after amendment, they adopted, and sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence.

The House returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, the proposed "canon, prescribing the mode of calling special meetings of the General Convention," with amendments.

The House then adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

SATURDAY, *June* 15.

The House met. Present as yesterday.

The House agreed to a resolve, respecting an alteration in the "first article of the general constitution," and sent it to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence.

The House proposed to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, "a prayer, to be used at the meeting of the Convention," and to be printed with the Journal of the present Convention.

The House adjourned to Monday morning, 9 o'clock.

MONDAY, *June* 17, 1799.

The House met. Present as on Saturday.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies returned to this House,

y their Secretary, the resolution for altering the "First article of the eneral constitution," with an amendment. Also the "Prayer to be sed at meetings of the Convention," with an amendment. Also, the Form of consecration of a church or chapel," with sundry amendents.

The house passed the resolution, respecting the alteration of the First article of the general constitution," with the proposed amendnent; which resolution is as follows, viz:

Resolved, That it be made known to the several state Conventions; hat it is proposed to consider and determine in the next General Conention, on the following alteration of the "First article of the conitution."

"Article I. There shall be a general convention of the Protestant Episcopal church, in the United States of America, on the third Tuesday in May, in the year of our Lord, 1805, and on the third Tuesday n May, in every fifth year afterwards in such place, &c." as before.

The house passed the "Prayer to be used at meetings of the Conention," with the proposed amendment.

The house approved of the amendments to the "Form of consecraion of a church or chapel," with an exception to one, which they ordered to be returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies: that they had receded from their amendment to the "Form of onsecration of a church or chapel;" which amendment had been disgreed to by this house.

The "Form of consecration," was then passed as amended.

A proposed canon was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, respecting the consecration of Bishops in the recess of the General Convention.

The above canon was returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with a proposed substitute.

The house received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies a proposed canon, repealing in part, the "Fourth canon of 1795, conerning the learning of those who are to be ordained."

The house passed the above canon.

The Right Rev. Bishop Provoost obtained leave of absence.

The house adjourned to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

TUESDAY, *June* 18, 1799.

The house met. Present as yesterday, except the Right Rev. Bishop Provoost.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies informed the house, that they had agreed to the proposed substitute to the canon, respecting the "consecration of Bishops in the recess of the General Convention."

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, presented to this house a proposed canon, to regulate the qualifications of Ministers to vote in the state and General Conventions.

The aforesaid canon was returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with a substitute for the title, and another proposed amendment.

The house concurred in the following resolution, which they received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, viz:

Resolved, That Trenton in New Jersey, be the place of meeting of the next General Convention.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies informed this house, that they had concurred in the amendments to the proposed canon, prescribing the "mode of calling special meetings of the General Convention."

The house then passed the above canon.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies informed this house, that they had concurred in the proposed "substitute to the title of a canon," which originated in their house; and that they had disagreed to the proposed amendment.

The house receded from the amendment, and passed the canon, in title as follows.

"A canon explanatory of part of the 'First canon of 1795.'"

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, informed this house, that they had finished the business before them, and were ready to rise.

The house declared that they also are ready to rise.

The house rose.

Signed by order of the House of Bishops.

WILLIAM WHITE, Presiding Bishop.

Attested, JOHN HENRY HOBART, Secretary.

CANONS—PASSED 1799.

CANON I. *Of the mode of calling special Meetings of the General Convention.*

THE right of calling special meetings of the General Convention, shall be in the Bishops; this right shall be exercised by the pre-

ing Bishop, or, in the case of his death, by the Bishop, who, according the rules of the House of Bishops, is to preside at the next Gen- l Convention; provided, that the summons shall be with the con- t, or on the requisition of a majority of the Bishops, expressed to n in writing.

The place of holding any special Convention, shall be that fixed on the preceding General Convention, for the meeting of the next neral Convention, unless circumstances to be judged of by the Bish- , shall render a meeting at such place unsafe; in which case, the hops shall appoint some other place.

NON II. *Of the consecration of Bishops in the recess of the General Convention.*

If, during the recess of the General Convention, the church in any te should be desirous of the consecration of a Bishop, the standing mittee of the church in such state, may, by their president, or by ne other person or persons, specially appointed, communicate the ire to the standing committees of the churches in the different tes, together with copies of the necessary testimonials; and if the jor number of the standing committees shall consent to the pro- ed consecration, the standing committee of the state concerned, y communicate the evidences of such consent, together with the er testimonials, to any three Bishops of this church, who may reon proceed to the consecration. The evidences of the consent the different standing committees shall be in the form prescribed the General Convention in the "2d canon of 1789:" and without aforesaid requisites, no consecration shall take place, during the ess of the General Convention.

CANON III. *Explanatory of part of the "1st canon of 1795."*

No clergyman employed by the year, or for any limited time, shall considered as a regularly officiating and resident Minister of the urch in any state, for the purpose expressed in the two concluding tences of the "1st canon of 1795," entitled "a canon concerning scopal visitation."

NON IV. *Repealing in part the "IVth canon of 1795," concerning the "Learning of those who are to be ordained."*

Whereas, by the "Canon of 1795," entitled "Of the learning of se who are to be ordained;" a power is vested in the Bishops of pensing with certain enumerated requisites in part, which power is only too indefinitely expressed, but may be abused, so much there-

fore of the said canon, as authorizes Bishops to dispense with any of the qualifications required in candidates for holy orders, is hereby repealed.

By order of the House of Bishops.

WILLIAM WHITE, D. D., Presiding Bishop.

By order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, D. D., President.

A PRAYER

To be used at the meetings of the Convention.

"ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, who by thy holy spirit, didst preside in the council of the blessed Apostles, and hast promised, through thy son Jesus Christ, to be with thy church to the end of the world; we beseech thee to be present with the council of thy church here assembled in thy name and presence. Save them from all error, ignorance, pride, and prejudice; and of thy great mercy vouchsafe, we beseech thee, so to direct, sanctify, and govern us in our present work, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable gospel of Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed, in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of sin, satan, and death; till at length the whole of thy dispersed sheep, being gathered into one fold, shall become partakers of everlasting life through the merits and death of Jesus Christ our Saviour. *Amen.*"

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A CHURCH HISTORY OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES, FROM THE THIRTIETH TO THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA. By MILO MAHAN, D.D., St. Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1860. 12mo. pp. 428.

Whether Professor Mahan has been successful in the important work which he has undertaken, must depend somewhat upon the class of readers for whom he writes. His work is not designed for the learned, or for professional scholars, but for the general reader, for students and candidates for Holy Orders. To prepare a History which shall even approach thoroughness and accuracy on such a period as that which he has chosen, is a task of the greatest possible difficulty. To group, to generalize, to convey a specific meaning, where most of the details must of necessity be omitted; to do this with entire accuracy and truthful fidelity, requires knowledge and judgment; and to do this effectively requires an artistic skill which few men possess. The daily routine of the Professor's duties has made him familiar with his subject, and his work shows him to be a close and observant student. His work is divided into three grand portions, which he calls, Book I.—The Apostolic Age, from John the Baptist to the Second Destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 30–135; Book II.—The Age of Martyrs and Doctors: from the death of St. John to the Development of the Alexandrian School, A. D. 100–232; Book III.—Development of the Churches and first Triumph of Christianity, A. D. 200–324. We know the difficulties with which the historian of the first of these periods is necessarily obliged to contend, and yet his Second and Third Books seem to us to be executed much the most successfully. Chapter Seventh in his Second Book, on "Heresies and Schools," is as a whole admirably done, and is the best chapter in the volume. The origin of the two great classes of Errorists with which the Church has always been afflicted, Fanatics and Rationalists, Montanists and Sabellians, and the position of the Church in dealing with them both, is stated with a philosophical clearness and accuracy which are admirable. If we were to quote from the author we should do it here. His Third Period brings him to an account of the North African Church, the Church at Carthage, the Roman Church, the Church and School of Antioch, the Egyptian Church, and to the great question of Church Life and Growth. In his two concluding Chapters he takes up the Times of Diocletian and the Victory of Constantine.

There is one feature in Professor Mahan's History which deserves special notice. He says in his Preface, "the best effort, like the worst, is merely a History *according to* this man or that, according to one bias or another." His aim apparently is, therefore, not only and merely to give the thread of historic narrative, but also "the development of Church life in individuals, in Schools, and finally in the great Provincial Churches;" or, as he terms it, "that living flow of events in their natural order by which history explains and justifies itself." Now this is precisely that method of writing history which at the present day is most popular; and yet, which seems to us most unsatisfactory. Both in secular and sacred history

it leaves too much to the historian. Doubtless it saves the reader from some thinking of his own. It also enables the writer to relieve his page of its possible dryness and dullness of detail, by the freshness of his own genius; and yet it is more than doubtful whether after all this is the true method of writing history. It is the, or rather a philosophy of history rather than history itself. Such works Walpole alluded to, when he said that "history was the only thing that he did not believe." It is this dashing word-painting which is already laying Macaulay on the shelf, and is sending sensible people back to old David Hume. Neander's Church History is conceived on the same false basis. We do not object to fiction in its place, but we do object, in the domain of History, as of Philosophy, to the Platonic dogmatism of making facts bend to theory. What we have a right to ask of the historian, is that he shall give an impartial and faithful narrative of the great events of History; and then, if he chooses to speculate upon them, let us have the speculation by itself, that we may form our own judgment upon it. We do not say that this is a cardinal fault of Professor Mahan's work, for it is not; yet we think that nearly if not all of those points where exceptions will be taken to his work, or where we should speak less confidently than he has done, are found in his theories rather than in his narrative. And most certain it is, that those portions of his work in which he has been most successful, are those in which he bends the strength of his learning and power, and he has both, to a simple and clear delineation of Church life and growth under the ordinary and extraordinary working of God's ever watchful Providence.

There are things introduced into the volume which seem to us out of place in a work designed to be a *Vade Mecum* of Church History for learners. Such for example is the extract from Eutychius. Why quote a writer of no authority, only to refute him? Nor do we think his preposterous assertions are met in the most effectual manner.

The work, however, will bear close examination, and may be confidently recommended. In comparison with any other one work on this most important period, it seems to us the very best history yet written for that class of readers for whom it was designed. Less of a theorist and of a rhetorician than Milman, in the clearness and fullness of historic narrative Mahan is incomparably to be preferred. The work gives full proof that the Students of the General Seminary are carefully and thoroughly drilled in one of the most important departments of their education. One of the great faults of the work is its brevity, and yet this is incidental to its plan. It traces the stream of history down to the time when the great battle of the Church for the Faith was about to be fought; she had proved that by physical weapons she was invincible, that fire and slaughter could not harm her. The forces for a more furious and terrible conflict had long been gathering, and were now marshaling for the combat.

THE YEAR OF GRACE; A History of the Revival in Ireland, A. D. 1859. By the Rev. WILLIAM GIBSON, Professor of Christian Ethics in Queen's College, Belfast, and Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. With an Introduction by Rev. BARON STOW, D.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 464.

The author of this volume, Prof. Gibson, was as good a man as could have been chosen, to write as good a defense as could have been written, of the late "Revival

in Ireland." He is a man of scholarly tastes, is apparently not a religious enthusiast, is a thorough believer in the System of Revivals, and is a staunch Calvinist. He addressed a circular, in the first instance, to every Minister of the General Assembly into whose bounds the Revival had reached; and, as the result of such general correspondence, he obtained about *three hundred communications* full of important information, as to the rise, progress, and results of the revival in every part of Ulster. The returns of about three hundred congregations show an increase in membership of at least *eleven thousand persons*. Of course this vast increase refers to the Presbyterian body alone. Other communions, we believe, have been similarly enlarged. One of his most important chapters is that in which he discusses the various theories by which the pathological phenomena of the revival are accounted for; as the imagination, the power of sympathy, mental, emotional, and nervous excitement, hysteriæ, &c. &c. He describes in detail the progress of the excitement in the Province of Ulster, within which the "Revival" was mostly confined; and gives in the Appendix carefully prepared tables of statistics as to the various Counties, showing the number of congregations affected, and the additions made to their communicants.

We add here, that the Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore, in his late Charge, bears witness to the late "Revival" almost equally favorable in its results to the Irish Church. His statement of facts we shall give under the head of Foreign Intelligence, unless we are again, as usual, crowded out. This whole subject of Revivals and the Revival System, whether viewed from a Calvinistic or Arminian standpoint, whether the excitement is attributed mainly to natural, or to supernatural causes, deserves close attention on the part of our Clergy. Their position demands of them that they should study and thoroughly understand it. These Revivals are among the marked phenomena of the times, and are to be accounted for only on principles which will completely explain those phenomena when fully ascertained. It was, however, and is now, quite too soon to write a "History" of the "Revival in Ireland." Thomas Prince's History of the Revival in this country in the days of Whitefield and Davenport, and the two Tennents, (a most remarkable book,) and the history of every religious excitement since, show that good men have differed in opinion widely on the subject. It is a safe path for Churchmen always to do their duty quietly and faithfully in what they believe to be Christ's way; never forgetting, however, to be at all times as wise as serpents and harmless as doves.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION: held after Luther and Melancthon. By CRANMER, RIDLEY and LATIMER. A Discussion, with Preliminary Matter, Notes, and a Preface. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson. 1860. 12mo. pp. 96.

Several months ago the Rt. Rev. Bishop WHITTINGHAM, of Maryland, became involved in a controversy with the *Southern Churchman*, of Va.; the Bishop contending that "Those who are really conversant with the writings of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, know that there can be no greater mistake than to claim them as opponents of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." In the course of the discussion, the *Southern Churchman*, by a forced construction of the Bishop's language, maintained that the Bishop had offered "to stake the cause of Baptismal Regeneration upon the teachings of Latimer;" and then the paper quotes certain well known words of old Latimer with an air of great confidence, and defiantly takes the ground that the party which that paper represents, "alone are the successors of the

Reformers; the Prayer Book is ours; and High Churchmen are in the Church by reason of its great toleration," &c., &c. The Bishop in the pamphlet before us carries the appeal to Latimer. He has given the whole controversy as it appeared in the columns of that newspaper, and he has therewith given a catena of testimony to show what were the real views which Latimer held on the doctrine of Baptism. He quotes from the authoritative Offices set forth by the Church, and used in the Church in the times of Latimer, and used by Latimer himself; he quotes from the writings of Latimer; he quotes from the friends, and companions, and intimate associates of Latimer, Cranmer and Ridley; and he quotes also from the Lutheran Continental Reformers, who, as is well known, shared so largely both in the confidence and the labors of their English brethren. We cannot hesitate to say that Bishop WHITTINGHAM has made out his case. There is not an impartial jurist in the world who will not declare that the Bishop has proved, beyond a doubt, the very thing that he attempted to prove.

The real ground of all the difficulty with the *Southern Churchman* is, that it differs from the Bishop (and from the Prayer Book and the New Testament, too,) as to the very meaning of the term Regeneration. The Bishop (and the Prayer Book and the New Testament, too,) means one thing; the *Southern Churchman* means another thing. What this something is, we shall not here attempt to state: except that we may say, it is something which grows of necessity out of the theory of Modern Calvinism. It did not belong to the Augustinians of old. The war which these men are waging, violently and honestly we doubt not, is not against Bishop Whittingham, it is against the Prayer Book itself; and so it is seen in England at the present day. And yet, strange as our words may seem to these men, the view of Baptism which the Prayer Book in its natural interpretation teaches is inseparably connected with the maintenance and preservation of the Evangelical doctrines of the Gospel.

We need say no more of this pamphlet than that it furnishes at a glance an aid to the right interpretation of the Baptismal Office, which cannot be found elsewhere within the same compass. We have carefully studied the writings of Bishop Whittingham on the nature of the Sacraments, and we assure the *Southern Churchman*, that he no more holds the Romish view on that subject, than do the friends of that paper; and that in a contest with the Romanists on that point, he would be the very last man whom they would care to meet.

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY; Including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. In Eight Volumes. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

The publishers have sent us a prospectus of their reprint of *Dean Milman's History of Latin Christianity*. The first volume is to appear on the first of the present October; the whole work is to consist of eight volumes, of which one will appear each month till the whole is completed.

CRITICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS; Collected and Republished by THOMAS CARLYLE. In Four Volumes. Boston: Brown & Taggard. 1860. 12mo. pp. 491, 490, 480, 524.

To those of our readers, and there are many such, who know who and what Carlyle is, we need only say that this Edition of Carlyle's Critical and Miscellaneous Essays was edited by himself, and contains the author's own annotations. It

is printed on fine paper, it has a copious Index, and a new Portrait from a miniature of recent date. Carlyle is one of the living powers of the day. We venture the assertion that no young person who has anything in him, can read Carlyle without feeling his pulsations quickened, and himself lifted above the ordinary level of thought and feeling. Carlyle's annihilation of shams of all sorts is terrible. The range of his reading has been almost boundless, and the resources of his intellect, as they have been poured out in his works, are more ample and varied than perhaps with any other living author of his class. His style is at times horrible; he is never a safe guide in philosophy or religion; but the troop of little imitators who try to copy his elephantine strides, who have the contortions of the Sibyl without the inspiration, make too laughable a burlesque to do any great amount of mischief. These four volumes contain the Essays and Reviews which Carlyle contributed to the Edinburgh, London and Westminster, and Foreign Quarterly Reviews, and to Fraser's and the New Monthly Magazines.

THE QUEENS OF SOCIETY. By GRACE and PHILIP WHARTON. Illustrated by Charles Altamont Doyle and the Brothers Dalziel. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 488.

We would not have called the subjects of these biographical sketches, "Queens of Society," at least until we had defined precisely what we meant by "Society." While some of the women whose lives are here written were as estimable in moral character as they were distinguished for literary talents and high social position, yet some were monsters of baseness and depravity. The profligacy of the courts of Louis XIV. and Louis XV., and the loathsome rottenness of French Society at the period of the Revolution are here depicted, and are at once a study and a warning. This attractive volume contains the lives of eighteen persons to whom the distinction is given of being the "Queens" of the Society in which they lived:—Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough; Madame Roland; Lady Mary Wortley Montagu; Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire; Letitia Elizabeth Landon, (L. E. L.); Madame de Sévigné; Sydney, Lady Morgan; Jane, Duchess of Gordon; Madame Récamier; Lady Hervey; Madame de Staël; Mrs. Thrale-Piozzi; Lady Caroline Lamb; Anne Seymour Damer; La Marquis du Deffand; Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu; Mary, Countess of Pembroke: and La Marquise de Maintenon.

THE CHURCH OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES: Or Notices of the Lives and Opinions of some of the Early Fathers, with Special reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity; illustrating its late origin and gradual formation. By ALVAH LAMSON, D.D. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 8vo. pp. 352.

This singular title is a very good index to the general character of the book itself. The running and leading title, "The Church of the First Three Centuries," is one thing; the "lives and opinions of some of the Early Fathers," are quite another and different thing; and the same indistinctness of conception, looseness of statement, and confusion of things in their nature wholly and utterly diverse, run throughout the whole volume. The author does not seem to have the slightest idea of the true use of the Early Fathers, or of the ground on which, and the purposes for which, the Church appeals to them. He is also wholly at fault as to the principle on which the Church at the Council of Nice proceeded in enunciating the Articles of the Nicene Creed. It simply declared the Old Faith in distinction from new forms of Errors by which the Faith was assailed. The author's attempt to attribute

to the Doctrine of the Trinity a Platonic origin is nothing new; yet when he attempts to cite Cudworth, and Horsley, and Mosheim, in proof that the "orthodox" Fathers were Platonists, and so, to prove from these authors, that these Fathers derived the doctrine of the Trinity from their Platonic Philosophy, he goes a step too far. Mosheim, for example, declares that the "*Scriptures* require a belief" of the Three Persons in the Divine Nature; and he proves that the tendency to explain the relations of the Persons to each other on the principles of the Platonic Philosophy, was one of the earliest sources of error and corruption in the Church. We have, however, in our previous pages devoted too much attention to the Doctrine of the Trinity as held and taught in the early Church, to need to go into its examination here. The tone of the author in speaking of the Nicene Symbol is such as almost leads us to hope he may yet see there is no other possible basis of Church Unity than Nicene Christianity; though we assure him that we accept that basis on other grounds than mere expediency.

UNITY AND ITS RESTORATION: Addressed to all Christians who desire to hold the Faith in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace. By a Presbyter of the Diocese of Illinois. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1860. 12mo. pp. 109.

As a clear, luminous statement of what Church Unity is; its Scripturalness, as a true note of the Church: its existence in the Primitive Church; how it was lost; how, and how only it can be restored; the difficulties and obstacles to the restoration: the motives to it—in respect to each and all of these important points, we have not seen a more taking thing than this pamphlet, by the Illinois Presbyter. He understands most thoroughly the two prevailing false theories of Church Unity, the Rationalistic and the Romish; and he has a rare facility in saying the very thing that he wishes to say. In tone, the work is honest, earnest and kind. Its cost is but a trifle, and we hope it will be ordered and read all over the Church.

THE RELATION OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TO THE CHURCH. An Address delivered before the State Convention of Massachusetts Sunday School Teachers, at Worcester, June 13, 1860. By F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D. Boston: Henry Hoyt. 1860. 8vo. pp. 42.

Professor Huntington in his transition from the Unitarian Sect to a true branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, has not taken that step without understanding fully the issues that are involved in it. It is not every man who is capable of grasping these deeper questions pertaining to the Life of Christ in the Church and in the hearts of her members. The question of Orders and Liturgies, important as it is, is seen in its proper position only as we comprehend the great plan of Wisdom and Grace, in its Author, object, means and legitimate results. Prof. Huntington's Address is a remarkable production. He handles elementary principles and deals with the shallow theology and the noisy shams of the day, like a master in Israel. Invited, as he was, to discourse before the above named Convention on one of the greatest of all themes, he seems to have determined like an honest man to declare what he believed to be the whole counsel of God. It was a strange audience of professed "Teachers" that was gathered before him; and strange indeed his words must have seemed to most of them; judging from the comments of their press, they seem to have felt that their modern platforms had all been taken to pieces as in a moment, without their knowing then, or knowing now, how it was done. Yet the Professor uttered not a word that could needlessly give offense; and his tone is that

of a man standing as in the presence of the Great Head of the Church speaking as from His lips. In the new and peculiar field to which he has been called, and which no one has surveyed more carefully than himself, or understands more thoroughly the culture to which it has been put for two hundred years, he will, with God's blessing, do a great work. But he will need the faith of Athanasius and the nerve of Polycarp.

OLD AND NEW. By the Rev. JAMES CRAIK, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Louisville, Ky. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 12mo. pp. 283.

What is Christianity? What is the Gospel? What is the Plan of Salvation as made known to us? and by which we are to be saved? This is the great question which Dr. Craik endeavors to answer. He does not, however, answer it categorically; but by exposing the two great fundamental errors, or classes of errors, on the subject, into which modern unbelief may be divided. Assuming that the Bible is the Rule of Faith, the ultimate authority, by which the *Credenda* and the *Agenda*, the things to be believed, and the things to be done, are to be tried, he meets the other equally important question, how the meaning of the Bible itself, the Revelation of God, is to be ascertained or interpreted? Shall it be by every man's interpretation according to his own private whim and fancy? or shall it be by elevating the Church into such a source or fountain of authority as that it can, independently and authoritatively, declare Articles of Faith? Dr. Craik shows that one of these notions is the fruitful origin of Sectism, the other is the equally prolific fountain of Modern Romanism. Dr. Craik maintains and shows that the Bible is to be interpreted by the men who wrote it; that they who planted the Church all over the world half a century before the New Testament was all written, must themselves be the safe, and the only safe guides to the correct understanding of the book itself. Nor is there the slightest difficulty in knowing what their interpretation is, as to all those things which are necessary to salvation. Dr. Craik's language is: "*The voice of the Church, thus uttered in the beginning by the command of her Lord, and continually pronounced ever since, dictating the terms of the Christian Creed, which by every man must be confessed*, is the third form appointed by the Divine care for assuring to every man the certainty of those things which he must know and believe in order to be saved." p. 71.

In the course of his examination, the author vindicates the principles on which the English Reformation was conducted; and he brushes away the flimsy cobwebs with which Rome has sought to impose her modern novelties as Articles of Faith on the consciences of believers. The principles of Dr. Craik's work are impregnable, and it bears throughout the impress of a master's hand. We are astonished to find a professedly Church paper saying that the work "is based on a fatal error;" and that its principles "have been maintained by Fisher, by Möehler, by Wiseman and by Kendrick, with an ardor at least equal to that of Dr. Craik, and they have been refuted by Chillingworth with an ability which neither Dr. Craik nor his Roman Catholic predecessors can claim." The least that can be said of such a writer is, that he does not know what he is writing about. The Clergy and the Laity will find the work worthy of careful study, and well adapted to general circulation.

LOVEL THE WIDOWER. A novel by W. M. THACKERAY, author of "Vanity Fair," "Pendennis," "The Newcomes," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 60.

We believe we have never, in the Review, taken up the Novels of Thackeray for the purpose of dissection, and do not propose to do it now; but we are glad to notice in the periodicals of the day a more truthful appreciation of this popular and yet in some respects, exceptionable writer.

THE PATHFINDER: OR THE INLAND SEA. By J. FENNIMORE COOPER. Illustrated from Drawings by F. O. C. DARLEY. New York: W. A. Townsend & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 515.

THE WING-AND-WING: or Le Feu-Follet. A Tale, &c. 12mo. pp. 486.

We are more and more impressed in the reperusal of these volumes, that the reputation of Cooper as the first of American Novelists is solid and enduring. Not only in his Sea Stories and his Leather-Stocking Novels where he is inimitable, but in other fields over which his imagination has wandered, as in his "Wing-and-Wing," his varied and almost matchless powers will be acknowledged by those who are not familiar with his writings. We have ready for publication an appreciative paper which will appear in an early No. of the Review.

THE WEST INDIES AND THE SPANISH MAIN. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE, Author of "Dr. Thorne," "The Bertrams," "The Three Clerks," "Castle Richmond," etc. etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 385.

Mr. Anthony Trollope is son to the Mrs. Trollope, whose book on the United States a few years ago, gave her an unenviable notoriety. His journey through the West India Islands, and so on to the "Spanish Main" as he calls it, or to New Granada and Central America, was extremely hurried, occupying only a few weeks, and his Journal is almost void of interest. We see that the work has attracted some attention in England.

ARMY LIFE ON THE PACIFIC; A Journal of the Expedition against the Northern Indians, the Tribes of the Coeur d'Alenes, Spokans and Pelouzes, in the Summer of 1858. By LAWRENCE KIP, Second Lieutenant of the Third Regiment of Artillery, U. S. Army. New York: Redfield. 1859. 12mo. pp. 144.

We are glad to see this well written account of the late Expedition of a small division of our Army, who were sent out to chastise the Indians for their murderous treachery toward Colonel Steptoe and his little heroic band, and to teach these savages a lesson for the future. Lieutenant Kip's sketch of the whole affair, of the battles, of the Indians, and of the Councils with them, and of the country, is spirited; and although the campaign was speedily terminated, it proved the efficiency of our national troops, and that they may be relied on to meet any emergency. We observe that in the Official Reports Lieut. Kip, who is a son of Bishop Kip, has honorable mention; and we remember that in the published accounts of the battles, the company of which he had charge distinguished itself for its daring and success. In telling his own story, however, in the volume before us, he exhibits the modesty of a true soldier.

HISTORY OF GENGIS KHAN. By JACOB ABBOTT. With Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 16mo. pp. 335.

The famous Genghis Khan, a noted military chieftain who acquired great power and dominion in Central India in the early part of the thirteenth century, forms the subject of another volume in the Messrs. Harpers popular series of Juvenile Histories.

TUDIES IN ANIMAL LIFE. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 146.

The theory of Life, Animal Life, Life in Form, the Classification of Animals. e theories of Species, the Development Hypothesis, and notices of Cuvier and me distinguished Naturalists—all these the reader will find in this well digested d well written little volume.

OSA; OR THE PARISIAN GIRL. From the French of Madame de Pressense. By Mrs. J. C. FLETCHER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 371.

When travellers tell us, as they so often do, that there is no such thing as *Home* France, and that here is one of the great defects in French Society, they pass a perficial, and to some extent an erroneous judgment. The scenes in this little lume are real, and the story is both a new and delightful one.

MOTHER'S TRIALS. By the Author of "My Lady." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 400.

ANESBURY HOUSE. By Mrs. HENRY WOOD. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 282.

The Scottish prize of £100 sterling was allotted to this Tale, as the best illustran of the evil results of Intoxicating Drinks, the advantages of Abstinence, and e demoralizing influence of the Liquor Traffic. It is written with ability.

SMALLER HISTORY OF GREECE; from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Illustrated by Engravings on Wood. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 248.

This is a more elementary work than the larger *History of Greece*, by the same thor, and is intended for the use of Public Schools, and to be followed, in adnced classes, by the larger work. We cannot too earnestly recommend the study the history of the most wonderful people in the world in our more Select Schools, preference to certain branches of physical science, like Physiology, &c., which e creeping into our Academies and our Schools for young girls, &c.

ATURAL HISTORY; For the use of Schools and Families. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M.D., Professor, &c., in Yale College. Illustrated by nearly 300 Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 382.

To what extent Zoology can or ought to be introduced as a branch of study into ir Common Schools, we cannot say. But as a class-book in that department of atural Science, Prof. Hooker's work is well adapted. The author has an evident ndness for such pursuits; and his language is scientifically accurate, while he rites in a popular style. The pictorial illustrations are very good, and to each apter are appended Questions for the use of teachers.

COMMENTARY, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospel of John; for the use of Ministers, Theological Students, Private Christians, Bible Classes, and Sabbath Schools. By JOHN J. OWEN, D.D. New York: Leavitt & Allen, 1860. 12mo. pp. 502.

Among the popular Commentaries of the day, we have rarely seen one from the nominations about us, so satisfactory as the one before us. Its great fault is, at it ignores, or depreciates, those Institutions which Christ Himself appointed,

not to stand in the place of, much less to be supplanted by, the internal work of God's Holy Spirit in the heart. In other respects it is orthodox, and it is devout, and sufficiently learned for common use.

THE SIGNET-RING, AND OTHER GEMS. From the Dutch of the Rev. J. De Liefde. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 362.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE; Suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land. By HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 354.

The Holy Scriptures, the Old Testament and the New, are full of allusion to the external world, some knowledge of which is requisite to a full understanding of the Sacred Narrative. The writer's personal observation in his visit to the Holy Land enables him to describe its geography, the habits, customs, &c., of the people, intelligibly, and his book in this respect has considerable value.

CASTLE RICHMOND. A Novel. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 474.

THE THREE CLERKS. A Novel. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 497.

RIGHT AT LAST; and other Tales. By Mrs. GASKELL. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 305.

CICERO ON ORATORY AND ORATORS. Translated or edited by J. S. WATSON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 379.

The great care with which "Bohn's Classical Library" has been prepared and issued in England, from which the Messrs. Harpers' volumes are reprinted, and the favor with which the Series has been received by scholars, cannot fail to secure to the American edition a wide circulation.

EURIPIDES ex Recensione FREDERICI A. PALEY. Accessit Verborum et Nominum Index. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 18mo. pp. 304.

This beautiful pocket edition of the Ancient Classics is printed in neat clear type, fully equal to the best German editions, and must become a favorite with students.

MORNING HOURS IN PATMOS; The opening Vision of the Apocalypse, and Christ's Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia. By A. C. THOMPSON, Author of "The Better Land," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 268.

We are glad to welcome so excellent a work; one so elevated, scholarly and devout in its tone. The author attempts no solution of the deep mysteries of the Book of Revelation; but in his late voyage along the shores of the Isle of Patmos, the message of the Apostle to the Seven Churches engaged his attention, and his devout meditations on that wonderful but too neglected portion of God's Word, are here embodied.

THE CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY has just issued the following new books which we give by their leading Titles. Several of them are written with decided ability, and in a style adapted to the tastes of the young, and all are published very neatly. They will, of course, find their way into all our Sunday School Libraries. There is no field of usefulness more worthy of the best pens of the Church, than that which our Sunday School Union offers. It is a great mistake to suppose that anybody

can write well enough for children, and one which this Society should resolutely frown upon.

SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE LITURGY. By the Rev. Dr. B. HALE. 18mo. pp. 96.

LIFE OF BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. By G. L. DUYCKINCK. 18mo. pp. 183.

THE CHRISTIAN'S MIRROR. By A. L. O. E. 18mo. pp. 287.

THE CONVERT OF MASSACHUSETTS. 18mo. pp. 172.

This is one of the best volumes the Society has published, and will make its mark wherever it goes. The great mass of children's books are as like each other as James' Novels; one is worth as much as the whole; a really fresh book is a prize; this is of that sort. It is a reprint of one of Parker's Series of Historical Tales. If the others are equally good why not give them all?

THE EXILES OF THE CEBENNA. 18mo. pp. 173.

This is a touching narrative of the sufferings of the early Christians, and is also one of Parker's Series.

THE CAVE IN THE HILLS. 18mo. pp. 141.

IDOLS IN THE HEART. By A. L. O. E. 18mo, pp. 339.

THE CHIEF'S DAUGHTER; Or the Settlers in Virginia. 18mo. pp. 162.

This little story of Pocahontas is also one of Parker's Series.

CLIMBING THE MOUNTAINS. 18mo. pp. 146.

RUTH AND HER FRIENDS; A Story for Girls. 18mo. pp. 338.

ARTHUR; and other Stories in Prose and Rhyme. By Mrs. BRADLEY. 18mo. pp. 134.

THE CAVERLY FAMILY; or Mrs. Linden's Teachings. By H. H. H. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1860. 12mo. pp. 251.

This is a pleasing story of rural life, with the not unusual grouping of Mr. Caverly the widower, three children of dissimilar tastes and dispositions, and the governess, Mrs. Linden, a pretty sensible young widow with glossy black hair. And then there is the Church, and the Rector, and the Confirmation Class; and, finally, the ordinary *denouement* takes place, and all are made very happy, and the widower and the widow lay aside their weeds and start for the White Mountains and come home by way of the Lakes and Niagara. The story is written by a Sunday School teacher and dedicated to her Class. With every other good wish, we hope she may be as useful in her book, as Mrs. Linden in her "teachings."

PRESBYTERIAN, METHODIST, AND BAPTIST Testimony to Confirmation, as a Primitive and Apostolic Rite. Witnesses: Calvin, Beza, Baxter, &c. Compiled by the Rev. B. WISTAR MORRIS, assistant minister of St. Luke's Church, Germantown. Philadelphia: Burns & Sieg. 1860. 18mo. pp. 95.

There is much more in this little work than is suggested by the title. It is not a mere *catena* of testimony in favor of Confirmation. The principle, or the leading idea of Mr. Morris, is, that "if we desire primitive unity, we must seek it through the restoration of *primitive institutions and primitive doctrines.*" He proposes, if encouraged, to go on and show, that before men's passions and prejudices were excited in this controversy, an Apostolic Ministry, Episcopacy, Liturgies, &c., were regarded as part and parcel of the Primitive and Apostolic Church. Mr. Morris is

entirely competent to prepare a series of volumes on these subjects, which will be of great value. We hope the Church Book Society will adopt the series and assist in placing the volumes in every Sunday School Library in the Church.

THE GOOD WAY; or Why Christians of whatever name may become Churchmen. New York: D. Dana. 1860. 12mo. pp. 79.

There is one feature of this little work of Mr. Tomlinson which is strongly marked and which constitutes its chief excellence. The reader feels at once that the writer is an honest man. And he *is* an honest man; he marches right on in his argument with the certainty of one who knows that as far as he goes he is right. If there is such a thing as a moral certainty; if, in God's Truth and God's Church, two and two do not make three, nor five, but four, and just four, no more and no less, and if the shameless and utterly unprincipled method of controversy which we so often witness of late on Church questions, deserves the rebuke of all honest men, whatever be their religious opinions; then we say the argument of Mr. Tomlinson is one which should be pressed faithfully and persistently. The pamphlet is a good one, but it will not be relished by those whose faith rests on everything in general, and nothing in particular; or by those the first article of whose Creed is "It makes no matter what man believes if the heart is only right." The great truth is, "it does make matter" what men believe. This *believing* wrong is one of the most subtle devices of the devil in our own times, and is the most effectual way to make men *do* wrong. They cannot *do* right, unless they *believe* right; for their *doing* is conditioned by their *believing*.

THE CHURCH AND THE PRESS; or Christian Literature the Inheritance of the Church and the Press an Educator and an Evangelist. Rev. Dr. A. C. Coxe's Sermon at Richmond, at the Eleventh Triennial Meeting of the S. S. U. and C. B. Society. New York: F. D. Harriman. 1859. 12mo. pp. 48.

Dr. Coxe appreciates the agency of the Press, which is, indeed, the "gift of tongues" to the modern Church; he sees its terrible perversion also in these our own times; and his appeal to Churchmen in behalf of this new engine of intellectual and moral power will not be in vain. The Notes to the Sermon are suggestive, and will be useful to those who are adding to their private Libraries.

ADDRESS to their Brethren of theLaity of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Lay Committees appointed at the Session of the General Convention, October. 1859. Philadelphia. 1860. 8vo. pp. 23.

In certain respects this Address is one of the most important publications of the times. It presents what that Committee regard as the true province of Lay Agency. It shows what the methods are by which this portion of the Church may and should discharge their duties to the Body of Christ. Such an appeal is a new note among us, but it has the true key, and we welcome it with gladness and gratitude. We hope our Clergy will every where respond to it so as to make it in the highest degree effective. We have made use of it in another connection.

REASONS for organizing the American Church Missionary Society. By a Presbyter Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 12mo. pp. 24.

We have given what we think the true answer to these "Reasons" on our previous pages. The pamphlet is ably and courteously written.

ev. Dr. RANDALL'S SERMON before the Protestant Episcopal Brotherhood o Baltimore. Boston: William A. Hall. 1860. 8vo. pp. 40.

The Rev. Dr. Randall is proving himself in his writings as well as in his official aracter, one of the most useful men in the Church. He sees clearly, thinks idly, and speaks honestly. He has the sort and degree of talent which the exncies of the age and of the Church call into full play. The age is an earnest e. Not that there are not shams enough even now, but they have to put on the pearance of reality, and are sure to be discarded as soon as they are exposed. In e Church, in place of real life, there has been a great deal of very solemn rhetic, but all this has had its day. Dr. Randall's theme is, "the Church's forces and ults, in the work of her progress for the conversion of the world." He utters rtain great truths suited to our times.

We acknowledge the receipt of the following pamphlets. Some of them are imrtant as discussing principles of great importance.

e Rt. Rev. BISHOP OTEY'S Sermon before the late General Convention, Oct. 5, 1859. "Christian Education."

e Rt. Rev. BISHOP ALFRED LEE'S Fifth Triennial Charge, June 6, 1860. "Present Duties of the Ministry."

e Rt. Rev. BISHOP H. W. LEE'S Second Charge, May 30, 1860. "Pastoral Visiting."

e Rev. Dr. BEARDSLEY'S (Conn. Convention) Sermon, June 12, 1860. "The Church and the Builders."

e Rev. N. PETIT'S (N. J.) Convention Sermon, May 30, 1860. "The Work of Ministers and People."

e Rev. Dr. FRANCIS VINTON'S Baccalaureate Sermon to the Graduating Class of Columbia College Law School, May 22, 1860. St. Luke, xi. 52.

'ESTERN ASSOCIATION'S (Mass.) Report on Lay Coöperation. 8vo. pp. 31. 1860.

ev. A. F. FREEMAN'S "Brief Hints for Episcopalians." Atlanta, Ga. 1860. pp. 27.

ev. D. H. SHORT'S Letter to the Rev. Mr. Spencer. Winsted, Conn., July 9, 1860.

r. P. W. ELLSWORTH'S Examinations of the Two Natures of Christ in their Relations to Physiology and Revelation. Hartford, Conn. 12mo. pp. 24.

ATALOGUE of the Theological Seminary of the P. E. Church in the Diocese of South Carolina. Camden, S. C., 1859–60.

EST CATALOGUE OF GRISWOLD COLLEGE. Davenport, Iowa.

OSPECTUS OF WHARTON COLLEGE. Austin, Texas, 1860.

OSPECTUS OF SHELBY COLLEGE. Shelbyville, Ky., 1860.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Adams, Charles F.	Green,	July 29, 1860,	St. Andrew's, Jackson, Miss.
Arnold, Francis F.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Beard, Thomas,	Cobbs,	June 20, "	St. Paul's, Lowndesboro, Ala.
Benton, Angels Ames,	Atkinson,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Chapman, Edgar T.	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Coleman, Leighton,	Potter, A.	July 1, "	St. James', Philadelphia, Pa.
Copeland, G. W. D.	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Crouch, Asher P	Hawks,	July 22, "	St. John's, St. Louis, Missouri
Cullen, Thomas H.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Doremus, David,	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Dunbar, Geo. Ward,	DeLancey,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Gibson, Lewis Wm.	Potter, A.	July 1, "	St. James' Philadelphia, Pa.
Gray, F. M.	McIlvaine,	June 24, "	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio
Gregg, Frank M.	Smith,	June 3, "	St. Paul's, Henderson, Ky.
Heald, Jessie Elliot,	Williams,	June 12, "	St. James' New London, Ct.
Herrick, James B.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Homans, James E.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Hotchkin, Samuel F.	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Howard, Henry Ripley,	Burgess,	July 11, "	St. Luke's, Portland, Me.
Hunt, George H.	Otey,	July 22, "	Christ, Nashville, Tenn.
Huntington, F. D., D.D.	Eastburn,	Sept. 12, "	Trinity, Boston, Mass.
Ives, Angus M.	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Kidder, James Holwell,	Burgess,	July 11, "	St. Luke's, Portland, Me.
Lee, D. J.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Lewis, Ammi Merchant,	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Nicholson, Albert Scott,	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Ogden, William Meredith,	DeLancey,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Pannill, D. H.	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Percival, C. S.	DeLancey,	Aug. 14, "	Grace, Utica, W. N. Y.
Pierce, Charles C.	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Purdy, Edward James,	Chase,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Smedes, Bennett,	Atkinson,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Staley, T. Jefferson,	Elliott,	July 6, "	Christ, Savannah, Ga.
Sweetland, Lucius,	DeLancey,	July 1, "	Trinity, New York City, N. Y.
Thompson, John Rogers,	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Tinsley, Peter,	Meade,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Vallandigham, Geo., M.D.	Bedell,	July 1, "	St. Peter's, Ashtabula, Ohio
Weldon, S. R.	Whitehouse,	June 17, "	Trinity, Chicago, Ill.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Adams, W. F.	Green,	July 29, 1860,	St. Andrew's, Jackson, Miss.
" Bishop, Addis, E.	DeLancey,	June 14, "	Trinity, Camden, W. N. Y.
" Brooks, Philip,	Potter, A.	May 27, "	Advent, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Cosby, John,	Johns,	June 29, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
" Dod, William A. D.D.	Odenheimer,	June 3, "	St. Mary's Burlington, N. J.
" Finch. P. Voorhees,	Williams,	July 3, "	Grace, Broad Brook, Ct.
" Hamilton, H. C.	Bedell,	July 1, "	St. Peter's, Ashtabula, Ohio.
" Kidder, Joseph,	DeLancey,	July 11, "	Grace, Lyons, N. Y.
" Lyle, Thomas,	Odenheimer,	June 2, "	St. Peter's, Spotswood, N. J.
" Reilly, Theoph. M.	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
" Watson, Edward S.	Odenheimer,	June 3, "	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Weller, M. Leander,	Green,	July 29, "	St. Andrew's, Jackson, Miss.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Calvary,	Johns,	June 20, 1860,	Culpepper Co., Va.
Christ,	DeLancey,	July 24, "	Forrestport, W. New York.
Christ,	Odenheimer,	June 12, "	South Amboy, N. J.
Christ,	Potter, A.	June 21, "	Media, Penn.
Christ,	Gregg,	May 27, "	Nacogdoches, Texas.
Emanuel,	Johns,	July 2, "	Hanover Parish, Va.
Emanuel,	Johns,	July 6, "	Richmond, Va.
Grace,	DeLancey,	July 28, "	Waverly, W. New York.
Grace,	DeLancey,	July 13, "	Cortlandville, W. New York.
St. John's,	DeLancey,	July 17, "	Oneida, N. Y.
St. John's,	Bowman,	Aug. 19, "	Ashland, Penn.
St. Paul's,	Smith,	June 1, "	Henderson, Ky.
St. Peter's,	Lee, H. W.	June 3, "	Fairfield, Iowa.
Trinity,	Hawks,	July 15, "	Hannibal, Missouri.
Trinity,	Whipple,	July 19, "	Anoka, Minnesota.
Trinity,	Gregg,	June 3, "	Marshall, Texas.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

The Rev. LEVIN I. GILLISS, died in Washington City, D. C., April 30, 1860, aged 84 years. He was born in Somerset Co., Maryland, in 1796. At a period when the Church was at the lowest ebb he gave himself to the work of the Ministry, and was ordained Deacon by Bishop Kemp in 1818. He was Rector of Queen Anne's, Prince Geo. Co.; in 1822, was Rector of St. Paul's, same County; in 1830, was Rector of Prince George and St. Bartholomew's, Montgomery Co.; in 1844 he removed to Washington City, and laid the foundations, and built up what is now the flourishing Parish and Church of the Ascension. The Bishop in his Address to the Convention, the Clergy of the City in appropriate Resolutions, and the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Hall in a Funeral Sermon, commemorate his strongly marked virtues.

The Rev. JOHN T. POINTS, Missionary at Ashland, Va., died in King William Co. Va., on Sunday, June 10th, 1860.

DIED in Vicksburg, Miss., July 1st, 1860, Major JAMES ROACH. The death of Maj. Roach is a serious loss to the Diocese of Miss., and to the Church at large, and his name deserves to be held in lasting remembrance. He was for many years Treasurer of the Diocese, and also Secretary and Treasurer of the Diocesan Missionary Society. He was a large contributor to the Episcopal Fund, and the cause of Church extension found in him a zealous co-worker. In the community he held various important posts of influence and honor, and the amplest assurances of public confidence and esteem were given to him. His crowning excellence was his humble earnest piety; at the last he leaned for acceptance with God upon the Cross alone, and not at all upon the many noble human virtues which the world justly ascribed to him.

HOBART COLLEGE.

At the late Convention of the Diocese of Western New York at Utica, the plan for the more ample endowment of this Church College received special attention. Of the $60,000 proposed to be raised, $34,500 are already given. The Bishop, Clergy and Laity, are animated with one spirit; and their far seeing wisdom and their zeal for Christ's Kingdom, will assuredly accomplish great results. Where, as in this vigorous and growing Diocese, the Church is held to be a reality, men will give their money, and themselves too, in its behalf. The Church dwindles everywhere, and of necessity, under any other policy.

VERMONT EPISCOPAL INSTITUTE.

The buildings of this Institution being completed, the first term, both in the Theological and Academical department, opened on Monday, September 3d. The Theological Department will be under the care of the Bishop, assisted by the Rev. Dr. Hicks as Willoughby Professor of Divinity. The Academic department is under the care of the Rev. Theodore A. Hopkins, who has been for several years, the efficient Principal of the Yeates Institute, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

THE CHURCH INTELLIGENCER, RALEIGH, N. C.

We are glad to put on our list of exchanges this new Church paper, of which the Rev. T. S. W. MOTT is Proprietor, and the Rev. F. FITZ GERALD, Editor. The Church at the South needs a sound Church paper of its own, and the *Church Intelligencer* as now conducted, can hardly fail to command entire success. It is true to the Church in its teachings; its editorials are readable and sensible; and it discusses practical questions in a thoroughly practical way. If well established it will eventually have a large Northern circulation, which for many reasons we earnestly bespeak in its behalf. Northern Churchmen would be benefitted in a good many ways by a more familiar acquaintance with their brethren at the South. The *Church Intelligencer* is the organ of the Bishops of Tennessee, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas, and the Missionary District of the South West, with their respective Dioceses.

BISHOP BURGESS AND CHURCH UNITY.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop in his Address to his late Convention has the following decided language: "The late General Convention was marked by its missionary earnestness, as well as by its honorable unity of spirit. These must accompany each other, that the Church of Christ may really prosper. Especially in Dioceses

this, with our small numbers, is it manifest that we must act with hearty con-
nce in each other, and in the doctrines and ritual of the Church, as able to speak
themselves, or we cannot act at all. If it be a privilege to be divided, we must
ense with it till we are stronger; and I am grateful to the 'Author of peace and
Lover of concord,' that while I hope you are prepared to contend for the faith
s delivered to the saints, and are also determined to maintain and minister 'the
ipline of Christ, as this Church has received the same,' there is no sign of a be-
that we need to be everywhere organized in two or more unmingling parties."
n accordance with the spirit of this Address a new Canon was adopted, by
ch "(Art. I.) The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Maine in its
nual Convention, shall constitute the Maine Episcopal Missionary Society."

MORE CONVERSIONS.

he following is only one instance of what might be witnessed in thousands of
s if we could only rid the Church of that intense worldliness which in one form
nother hinders her progress.
.t Weston, Missouri, population 3,000, a German Lutheran congregation, the
;est in the place, is about to join the Protestant Episcopal Church, following
r minister, who, formerly a Romish Priest, has now applied to be received into
Reformed Catholic Church. He has always used our Liturgy in his public
istrations, and is said to be highly esteemed in the community for his ability,
ning and many virtues. He can preach in both English and German.

PRESBYTERIAN AND CONGREGATIONAL MISSION IN SYRIA.

he present disastrous state of things in Syria is likely to affect seriously Mis-
ary movements in that region. The American Board have nine mission stations
yria, nine out-stations, eleven missionaries, one printer, thirteen female assistant
sionaries, three native preachers, thirty-six teachers, and other native helpers.
or nearly all, of these missionaries were gathered at Beyrout, at last accounts,
ing left their stations for a place of greater safety.

CHURCH MISSION TO THE DACOTAH INDIANS AND BISHOP SEABURY SCHOOL.

mong the signs of new life in the Church are the efforts now put forth in behalf
he aborigines of the country. Bishop Lay has already appealed to the Church
ehalf of the Cherokees, Creeks and Choctaws. In June last, Bishop Whipple
the Rev. Mr. Breck visited the Dacotah country. The Dacotahs, under treaty,
nber 2,100 on the South Reservation, which is fifty miles in length, by ten in
adth; and 4,000 on the North Reservation, which is one hundred miles in length
ten in breadth; both lying lengthwise along the east shore of the Minnesota
er. The first is called Red Wood, and the second Yellow Medicine. On St. John
tist's day, they held, through an interpreter, public service and preached. The
neral Confession, Lord's Prayer, a chapter from the Bible, the Ten Command-
nts, with the response as in the Communion Service, and hymns, were all in the
otah language. When it is remembered that this was the first service of the
rch ever had in this nation, numbering in and without Minnesota, perhaps sixty
usand souls, both the adaptation of a liturgical service, and its harmonious char-
er, must be acknowledged by all. For no people is a Liturgy needed so much,

as for the illiterate and newly converted tribes. The most remarkable feature of all in the appearance of this Indian congregation, was the fact that the entire body of aborigines present was habited in the citizen's dress. This is the first instance on record of anything of the kind, as a Pagan people. At the close of the service, one of the principal men arose and said, that all present had a council last evening, when it was determined to invite the Missionaries to come amongst them, to teach them and their children. He expressed their fixed determination to stand firm in their civilized life, and many other words he added, which would have sunk deep into the hearts of every friend of this Mission, could they have witnessed so remarkable a sight as was permitted in the depths of this wilderness. An intelligent Dacotah boy, named Nee-in-dah (Passing Cloud), and another, a mixed blood, accompanied the Bishop back to Faribault, to enter the Indian department of the Bishop Seabury school. Shortly a candidate for Holy Orders will receive the commission of Apostolic hands for this field of labor. Thus the two first graduates of the Bishop Seabury Divinity School, will be Indian Missionaries. The first a native, for the Chippewas; and the second, a white man, for the Dacotahs.

NOTE. A large amount of Domestic and a carefully prepared Summary of Foreign Intelligence are necessarily crowded out.

CORRECTION.

The Article in the July Review on "Romish Perverts," and which has attracted much attention, contained a few statements more or less incorrectly given.

No. 8. Rev. George F. Haskins, was not originally a Congregationalist; he was brought up a Churchman under the famous Rev. Dr. Gardner of Boston. His whole history is suggestive; but his perversion reflects no dishonor on the Church.

No. 22. Rev. Ferdinand E. White, was not "originally a Methodist," but was born of Church parents, and was baptized and confirmed in the Church.

No. 30. Rev. F. A. Baker, we are assured, was never himself, a Methodist; he was, however, of Methodist parentage. He was not educated at "a Romish Seminary," but at Princeton; nor did his brothers "become Romanists."

The list of converts *from* Romanism was not given as complete, or as approaching completeness. We shall hereafter give this portion of the record in as perfect form as possible.

We have also been furnished with an interesting paper, containing in tabular statements, curious biographical facts in Church history, the fruits of a wide course of reading, which will appear hereafter.

THE

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XIII. JANUARY, 1861. No. 4.

ART. I.—LIMITS OF THOUGHT.

1.—*Lectures on Metaphysics.* By SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

2.—*The Limits of Religious Thought examined in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year* 1858, *on the Bampton Foundation.* By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

THE two works at the head of this Article, have awakened attention anew to a most important subject in Philosophy—the Limits of Human Thought. Sir William Hamilton discusses this subject with clearness and ability, in its most general aspects, in that portion of his Lectures which relates to the Regulative Faculty of the Human Mind; and Mr. Mansel, a disciple of Sir William Hamilton, applies the principles of this great teacher in Metaphysical Science to the determination of the limits of thought in the great matter of Religion.

And, certainly, there is no more vital question in Philosophy than this. To know the legitimate bounds of Human Inquiry is alike important for the establishment of a sound Philosophy, and for the maintenance of a true Revelation from God in the purity in which it has come to us from Heaven.

The particular question which is raised by both these writers, which, many years since, was discussed with singular ability and conclusiveness by Sir William Hamilton, is, whether the Absolute and the Infinite, or, including both of them under the comprehensive word, the Unconditioned, is cognizable by the Human Mind? On this question different positions have been taken by the great thinkers of the human race, by the leaders of metaphysical thought and founders of metaphysical systems.

Sir William Hamilton, in his discussion of the subject, divided the opinions which had been promulgated about it into four classes; but they are substantially resolvable into two, with two specific differences in each of the classes. The first class comprises the opinions of those who hold that the Unconditioned, or, in other words, the Absolute and the Infinite, is not cognizable by man. Of this class of opinions there are two subdivisions. The first is the opinion maintained by Sir William Hamilton that the Unconditioned is neither cognizable nor conceivable, but that it is, to the human mind, a term which simply expresses the negation of the utmost verge of that, which men can know and conceive, the negation of every condition or limit, which attaches itself to every possible subject of human thought or conception.

The second subdivision of this first class of opinions is that which has Kant for its Representative. He maintains, that the Infinite is not cognizable by the Human *Understanding*, but that in the effort to reach it by the Understanding, passing onward from limit to limit still more remote, the Infinite extends into the domain of the *Reason*, which appropriates it, and holds it, as a true and necessary idea, albeit the Reason cannot, by any means, comprehend it. Yet it is not, in his view, an idea entirely and purely negative.

The second class of opinions is that of those who maintain that the Unconditioned is cognizable by man, and of this class there are two subdivisions. The first is the view of which Schelling, the Plotinus of Germany, as Mr. Mansel well calls him, is the Representative. He maintains that the Absolute and the Infinite are cognizable by man; that man may know,

ay, in fact, identify himself with the Absolute; but then, to
› this, he must leave the domain of consciousness, and lose
imself and the consciousness of his personal identity in the
›undless expanse of the Absolute and the Infinite, into
hich he has been transplanted. In one word, this theory
akes the Absolute and the knowledge of the Absolute one
ıd the same, and calls man out of the scene and conditions
: all other knowledge that he may realize the Absolute and
ecome one with it. The second subdivision of the class of
pinions, which maintain the Unconditioned to be cognizable
y man, is that which is represented by Cousin, who teaches
ıat the Absolute and the Infinite are cognizable, but that the
nowledge of them, nevertheless, is reached by consciousness
ıd within the domain of consciousness; that the knowledge
: them is a knowledge of which, those who possess it, can be
›nscious.

To determine which, among these various opinions, is true
ıd tenable, we should ask ourselves, can that which is finite
rasp and comprehend the *Infinite?* Can the measure exceed
s own capacity? or, though a finite measuring rule be applied
›ntinually and repeatedly, as long as men and all the genera-
ons of men can continue to apply it to the Infinite, to illimi-
ıble time or space, for example, can it, at each successive limit
hich it reaches, have compassed that to which there is abso-
ıtely no bound? When we try to conceive eternity, says an
ld writer, we are always tying the two ends together; the
wo ends, that is, of what has no beginning and no end. Kant,
hile he maintains that the idea of the Infinite is one, which
he Reason necessarily forms, yet admits that it reaches forth
› find a limit and an end, and only finding limit recede be-
ond limit, at length sinks down, exhausted, into the convic-
ion that there is an Infinite, though the utmost verge of the
ision of human reason is a *bound*, which is clearly discerned
ıd perceived. This admission is a virtual confession that the
nfinite, though it must be believed, cannot be reached or con-
ıived by a finite mind; that such a mind cannot get beyond
he regions of the limited.

It has been said by way of illustration, on the part of those

who hold that the Infinite is cognizable by man, that we cannot, for example, see around and so comprehend in our actual vision, a vast mountain; but that we can, nevertheless, approach it, and touch it, and see a portion of it, so that we can conclude that it is vast, and may be said to know and comprehend its vastness, though we do not embrace the whole of it in the field of our vision. But, in this illustration, the outward vision corresponds to the inward conception with which, it is said, that we embrace the Infinite, and surely the comparison fails to illustrate the point which it is adduced to illustrate. For the mountain, in the case supposed, is not seen and comprehended in the field of outward vision, any more than the Infinite is comprehended by the inward mental conception. Our idea of the mountain is a mental conception, and it is one which sets limits to its object. The vision with which we see a part of the mountain and thence conclude that the whole is more vast than that part which we see, may, indeed, faintly image the effort of mind, with which, from the bounded and the conditioned, which we can think and conceive, we conclude that there is that which is unbounded and unconditioned that we cannot think or conceive.

Schelling saw clearly that the attempt to construct the idea of the Absolute and the Infinite within the bounds of Consciousness, in which all knowledge is under the conditions of difference and plurality, the I which thinks, and the Non-Ego which is thought—the subject and the object of thought, was futile and suicidal. He therefore boldly threw away the bonds and limits of conscious thought, when he launched forth into the sea of the boundless and the Infinite; and maintained that, only by abjuring the conditions of human knowledge, only by not being conscious, not knowing, that is, that we know, can the Absolute and the Infinite be known. To be the Absolute and the Infinite and to know them, are, with him, one and the same. But then the question arises, how can this knowledge, if it be possible to man, be verified by man. The moment, if the supposition can be entertained, the knowledge of the Absolute is brought within the bounds of Consciousness, it ceases to be the Absolute; and what witness is there

hen to declare to man that, beyond the province and ken of lonsciousness, the Absolute is cognizable and has been known y man. The inevitable conclusion from this theory is, that to ıan, since Consciousness is the witness of his knowledge, the nowledge of the Absolute, out of the sphere of Consciousness, ı a mere nonentity, or since, on the theory in question, the Ab-)lute and the knowledge of the Absolute are the same, the ıbsolute itself is Pure *Nihilism.*

And, in fact, by the followers of Schelling this conclusion as been distinctly and boldly avowed. We quote the forcible ınguage of Sir William Hamilton, exposing this theory of chelling.

"The intuition of the absolute is manifestly the work of an arbitrary abstrac-on, and of a self-delusive imagination. To reach the point of indifference, we nihilate the object, and we annihilate the subject of consciousness. But what mains? nothing. We then hypostatize the zero; we baptize it with the name of e Absolute, and imagine that we contemplate absolute existence, when we only ıeculate absolute privation. This truth has been indeed virtually confessed by the vo most distinguished followers of Schelling. Hegel at last abandons the intui-on regarding 'pure' or 'undetermined existence' as convertible with '*pure noth-ıg;*' while Oken, if he adheres to the intuition, intrepidly identifies God or the bsolute with Zero. Nor has the negative chimera proved less fruitful than the ositive; and Schelling has found it as difficult to evolve the one into the many, as ken to deduce the Universe and its contents from the first self-affirmation of the rimeval nothing.'"

Schelling, seeing that the limitations of difference and plu-ality, which belong to all conscious knowledge, were fatal to he comprehension, within the bounds of consciousness, of the ıbsolute, which is one without difference or plurality, aban-oned Consciousness, when he accorded to man an intuition of he Absolute, but, at the same time, he abandoned the only ritness which could establish the reality of that intuition.

Cousin, discerning this, maintained that the Infinite might e known within the bounds of Consciousness, and so sought o preserve the witness who could testify to the reality of the nowledge, but, at the same time, he encountered the rock rhich Schelling had discerned and avoided, the impossibility f knowing that which is one and unbounded, by a mind, rhich, like the mind of man, can only think and know under he condition of limitation by difference and plurality; only

cannot seize the point of spontaneous view, except by taking it, so to speak, in the fact, under the point of reflective view, at the dawn of reflection, at the moment, almost indivisible, when the primitive fact gives place to the actual, when spontaneity expires in reflection. Not being able to consider it fully and wholly at our ease, it is necessary to seize it by a rapid coup d'œil, and, so to speak, in profile, in the acts of the ordinary life which repeat themselves naturally in consciousness, and permit themselves to be perceived without one's seeking to perceive them. It is this natural consciousness which it is necessary to surprise by itself and faithfully to describe."

The attempt, by personal consciousness, to seize such perceptions of impersonal Reason, reminds one of the fruitless effort to bind the sea god.

> "Effugiet tamen haec sceleratus vincula Proteus,
> Fiet aper, modo avis, modo saxum, et, cum volet, arbor."

And, accordingly, as the result of such an effort to catch the spontaneous perception, all that Cousin can say is, "Now I *think* that primitive consciousness presents the same elements, the same facts, which reflection does, with this single difference, that, in the second, they are precise and distinct, and, in the first, they are obscure and undetermined." But all the analysis, which he gives, of the precise and distinct perceptions of Reflected Reason really brings forth no more than Sir William Hamilton maintains to be the limits beyond which the weak reason of man cannot advance. The difference between him and Cousin is, that he admits the weakness of Reason, while Cousin would elevate that weakness into the positive power of Reason to conceive the Infinite and to penetrate the Absolute Essence of God. The one system ministers to the pride of intellect; the other humbles it in the truest exaltation, before Him, who is its Infinite fountain. The one makes Reason the measure and the judge of Religion; the other receives Religion as a Revelation from the Infinite One to the faith of His finite and dependent creature, man.

The analysis of Cousin does not support the strength of his assertion of the power of Reason to conceive the Infinite, but is, as we understand him, a virtual concession of the ground, which Sir William Hamilton so ably maintained against him. Cousin says plainly, that "it is repugnant to think that an indefinite series equals the Infinite; for, after all, the indefinite is only the finite multiplied by itself;" and yet the highest

product of the Reflected Reason, as he represents it, is the Indefinite and not the Infinite. We give his analysis that it may speak for itself.

"With regard to the Infinite Being, primitive Consciousness does not manifest to us the action of Reflected Reason, which sets forth that Being as Infinite, Absolute, Necessary, but Primitive Consciousness manifests to us the spontaneous action of reason, which perceives the Infinite Being at first with a pure and simple perception without seeing limits to it, and there reposes without seeking or conceiving aught beyond. The Primitive fact does not contain explicitly any idea of limited and of unlimited, of finite and of infinite, but it contains implicitly, in its confused perceptions, all that reflection comes to clear and to convert into distinct and necessary truths. Where natural consciousness had perceived vaguely natural limits, Reflection places essential limits; where primitive Reason had reposed without perceiving limits, developed Reason affirms that there are no possible limits, and it is by the aid of this double light, that the distinct ideas of finite and Infinite, of relative and absolute, which preëxist confusedly in the primitive fact, are successively produced. The more reflection applies itself to this first fact, the more do the facts which it contains disclose themselves, the more does intelligence enlarge itself, the more do the limits of human knowledge recede before the liberty of man. The Primitive fact which offered only the obscure complexity of the Ego, of the Non-Ego, and of the Absolute Being, breaks itself in pieces, and makes itself clear as it breaks, in the reflection, which, then, distinguishing clearly the Ego and the Non-Ego, the multiple and the individual, opposes them clearly, the one to the other, in the bosom of the Absolute Being, which explains them and contains them both."

Here, surely, according to this statement, all that Reason apprehends is *the indefinite*, the negation of the finite; this is the utmost that the analysis furnishes. Cousin himself says, "indefinite quantity is the defective sign of the infinitude of God," and this indefinite quantity is all that his analysis produces. The weakness of Reason, its inability to comprehend the Infinite, in which it must believe, is demonstrated, and *not* the positive power of "penetrating into the region of existence," which the venturous philosophy of Cousin, whose chosen motto is "*aude sapere*," would assign to Reason. His effort is a most noticeable one, as an attempt to convert weakness into a symbol and a proof of power; to evolve, from what he admits to be a negation, a distinct and clear apprehension of the Infinite and the Absolute.

And, in fact, the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the whole Modern Philosophy of Germany, from Schelling to Hegel and his followers, is the assumption, the pertinacious conviction, that it is the

usiness of Philosophy to comprehend and know the Absolute—either, by making the Ego, like Fichte, its synonyme and ts representative—or by boldly projecting the reason of man nto it, with Schelling. This determination to know and omprehend the Absolute as the Ultima Thule of speculation, s at the foundation alike of the Pantheism, the Scepticism, he manifold, unbelieving Rationalism, which have proceeded rom that portion of the earth, and brooded upon it, like the larkness of Egypt, shutting out the light of Heavenly Truth. The exposure of the falsity of the fundamental principle of his whole scheme of speculation has, therefore, deep practical, s well as theoretical interest and importance. It is a work eedful to be done, that Philosophy may discharge her rightful ffice as the handmaid of Religion, and recognize the limits, which separate her domain from the exclusive province of Faith.

These different systems of the Absolute and the Infinite, to which we have adverted, are well contrasted and exposed, and that of Cousin is elaborately refuted by Sir William Hamilton in an Article in the Edinburgh Review of October 1829, an Article which will repay the labor of those who may choose to recur to it. Those who maintain, like Kant, that the Infinite is a necessary, not purely negative, idea of the Reason, although an idea, which it rather reaches after and follows to the limits of its own power of progress, than comprehends,—are obliged to admit that, in the attempt to comprehend it, the Reason becomes involved in insoluble contradictions. It must conceive the Absolute as that, which is one and complete, while it is the whole,—and yet, in the fields of space, let Reason take what excursions it will, it can never reach this whole, which is finished, and beyond which no other space is conceived to be. Reason, too, according to Kant, must adopt, as a necessary idea, the Infinite; and yet, to all its conceptions, the largest and the widest, of time, for example, and of space, there are limits—and existence, without time and space, it cannot think or conceive. And so, between the phenomenal universe, or between the conceptions we must form of time and space on the one hand, and the ideas of the Absolute and the

Infinite on the other, which are alleged to be necessary ideas of the Reason, there is a contradiction, which Reason cannot solve,—except by denying the reality of the phenomenal universe and of time and space, except, therefore, by rejecting the testimony of consciousness, and making our nature itself to be a lie because of the contradictions, which it requires Reason to accept and acquiesce in.

These contradictions, inherent in the Speculative and the Practical Reason, according to the system of Kant; this transcending the bounds and the laws of Consciousness, that man may project himself into the Absolute and the Infinite, which Schelling teaches; this derivation of the Universe from Pure Nothing by Oken; and this ascending, with Hegel, by the ladder of Consciousness, into a knowledge, of which Consciousness has no cognizance, and which, nevertheless, must be apprehended within the bounds of consciousness according to the teaching of Cousin,—all these various efforts of men to comprehend the Absolute and the Infinite, which involve them in such hopeless contradiction and departure from the laws of their being, and denials of the Nature, which God has given them, point irresistibly to a better and a truer conclusion concerning the cognizance of the Absolute and the Infinite by man.

That conclusion, we believe, has been well and clearly established by Sir William Hamilton in the Article before alluded to, and in the Course of Lectures, whose title is at the head of our Article. These Lectures, for their learning, their metaphysical acuteness, and the clearness, the breadth and depth of their expositions and their analysis, we take occasion most highly to commend. To commend Sir William Hamilton as a metaphysician is indeed *agere actum;* but it may not be superfluous to say, that, in these Lectures, there is not that severely dry and abstract style, which characterizes some of his dissertations. These Lectures are beautifully lucid and attractive in their style, not unworthy of companionship, and what more can we say, with the philosophical style of M. Victor Cousin, upon whose lips, as he made his way through the most searching and delicate analysis, thousands have hung with

nsport, and whose luminous, glowing pages have been the arm of two hemispheres.

In establishing his conclusion concerning the Absolute and e Infinite, Sir William Hamilton uses one of the great laws thought, that of Excluded Middle or Mutual Contradiction. he Law is simply this,—of two contradictories, which mutuly exclude each other, one must necessarily be true. No mide ground between them can be assumed. The object, which I ve in my range of vision, is either white or not white,—either und or not round,—either so circumstanced, as we may supse, or not so circumstanced. Now, if we try to think of the solutely bounded, or of the Infinite, of absolute space or infite space, for example, we cannot conceive either of these exmes. We cannot conceive space, which is absolute, comete, and the whole of space; for whatever globe or sphere of ace we might think or conceive would lie in a larger outlying obe or sphere surrounding it, and so, in our efforts to think solute space, we shall pass onward from concentric sphere to here, and yet never reach, in thought, that absolute space, which we should be in pursuit; in endless pursuit, without er attaining or comprehending it. The idea is, to us, an conceivable one. And equally inconceivable is the idea of finite or unbounded space. If we try to comprehend that, e infinite will still recede before us, as we pass, in thought, nit after limit, within the boundless fields of space, till we all sink, wearied and exhausted, in the pursuit. And yet, ie of these contradictories must be true. Space must be unded or unbounded. A primary Law of thought teaches the necessary truth of one of these propositions. And yet, th are equally inconceivable. That, therefore, which is inconceivable, by man, must, nevertheless, be owned and admit. by him to be true. The same conclusion would be reached applying the same course of reasoning to time, by considerg it as beginning, or as running back without beginning. nd the conclusion is, that the conceivable by man, that, hich he can comprehend in thought, lies between these inconivable contradictories, which, on the one side and the other, e the limits of human thought. Man can think and com-

prehend the Conditioned. The Unconditioned lies beyond the range of his powers of distinct thought and comprehension.

But, in truth, this whole method of attempting to conceive either the Absolute or the Infinite supposes a quality to belong to them, which is not a constituent of either of them. It is an attempt to reach them in successive parts of a line of progressive thought, and of neither of them can a part be properly predicated. It is an attempt, moreover, to conceive the Absolute as a bounded whole, whereas the very idea of a boundary is an idea of relation, and is, of course, inconsistent with that, which is Absolute or without relation. And yet, this method is the only one, in which we can even attempt to comprehend the Absolute or the Infinite. It reduces them to that, which, clearly, they are not, and it therefore demonstrates how inconceivable to man either the Absolute or the Infinite is.

And yet the Unconditioned, which is a denial of that, which is within his capacity of thought and comprehension, he must believe to exist, because one of the inconceivable contradictories must be true. So does he plant himself firmly upon a belief in the reality of the Unconditioned, without disowning a single testimony of Consciousness, without summoning Consciousness to bear witness to mental perceptions beyond the bounds of his personality, or without maintaining that his nature is a lie, because it compels him to hold, among the highest products of the Reason, contradictions which he cannot solve. He believes and he accepts the testimony of Consciousness; and he admits also his own weakness and limited capacity, and that there are realities of the Universe, which are wholly beyond the limits, to which his insight and his power of comprehension can extend.

Sir William Hamilton has rendered, in our view, an inestimable service to true Philosophical inquiry, by establishing, so clearly and solidly, the bounds, within which, by the laws of our intellectual nature, our inquiries can attain any sure and comprehensive results. We believe that he states the simple truth concerning the value of his labors in this department of philosophy in the following words. Speaking of Kant, he says:

'He endeavored to evince, that Pure Reason, that Intelligence, is naturally, is essarily, repugnant with itself, and that speculation ends in a series of insole antilogies. In its highest potence, in its very essence, thought is thus infected h contradictions, and the worst and most pervading scepticism is the melanly result. If I have done anything meritorious in philosophy, it is in the atpt to explain the phenomena of these contradictions; in showing that they se only when intelligence transcends the limits, to which its legitimate exercise estricted; and that within these bounds (the Conditioned,) natural thought is ther fallible, nor mendacious.—"Neque decipitur, nec decipit unquam." If this w be correct, Kant's antinomies, with their consequent scepticism, are solved; l the human mind, however weak, is shown not to be the work of a treacherous ator."

Mr. Mansel, in his Lectures, has used this principle, so early established by Sir William Hamilton, this law of the nditioned, to point out the limits of Religious Thought, and demonstrate that Pantheism, Atheism, and Rationalism in eir various forms, have their origin in the neglect by men of e limits of human thought, and in their endeavor to transnd these bounds, that they may comprehend and define what s not been placed within the power of man's comprehension, ithin the grasp of his most excursive thought.

And, to us, it seems that he has done an admirable service Religion in this his work. The Principle, which he uses, is, his hands, a most effective weapon against the various forms false philosophy and false religion, based upon that philosohy, which he encounters. To exhibit the singular effectiveess of the weapon, would be to re-write his book. Those, who ould know the temper and the keenness of the blade, and the ill with which it is wielded, must follow Mr. Mansel through e pages of his elaborate work. And those who would see ch specimens of the Pantheism and Dogmatism on the one and, and the Rationalism and Humanitarianism on the other, hich a neglect or contempt of the just limits of philosophical nd religious thought has produced, can be fully gratified in e copious Notes, which Mr. Mansel has appended to his work, nd which, in the American edition, are translated, so that hey are accessible to all readers. They will find a collection f all the varieties of a Godless Philosophy, in its several tages and gradations, from Pantheism, to Atheism and Scepicism,—from the absurd aspirations of those, who would raise

man to the Absolute and the Infinite, and destroy his personality or his consciousness in the effort, to the daring and blasphemous attempts of them, who would identify Deity with the mass of humanity, or even, like Comte, with the better portion of humanity, and of the animals inferior to man in the scale of being; this last discovery being one of the most precious results of the Positive Philosophy, which would acknowledge no existence and no God beyond the range of the human understanding.

We propose, simply, in any further remarks upon the work of Mr. Mansel, to indicate the failure of some of his critics to ascertain the true drift of his argument; and to notice an objection against his teaching, which, if it were valid, would certainly render it impossible, by that teaching, to evince the truth or the reality of any Religion, or the possibility of believing in any God, from whom a Revelation can be received.

Now, with regard to the general tenor of Mr. Mansel's argument, it is to be observed, that if his fundamental assertion that the Unconditioned cannot be known by man, or to give it a more concrete form, that He, who is the First Cause, who is Absolute in His Perfection, and Infinite in His Attributes, cannot be known by man; if this principle be untrue and unsound, then the whole of Mr. Mansel's argument falls; for it is, wholly and throughout, built upon this foundation; and, in that case, he has failed to furnish an argument of any validity against the systems of Godless Philosophy and false religion, the untenableness and groundlessness of which it has been his object to show. If his fundamental principle is untenable, his book loses all its value as a contribution to the service of Religion. This has not always been seen by those, who have criticised his book. He has been represented as doing service in the exposure of false and Godless systems, even if he has been mistaken in the fundamental principle of his philosophy, whereas the fact is, that he has used this principle and this principle alone and throughout, to show that these systems can never be held or established in accordance with the known and demonstrated laws of the human mind; in consistency with the observance of those limits, which God has set to hu-

n thought. His whole argument, then, depends upon the ablishment of this great principle, upon which it rests, upon impossibility of the human mind thinking or comprehend- anything but the Conditioned.

And certainly it would be a fatal detection of the falsity of s principle, if its logical consequence were shown to be the possibility of man's knowing or believing that God, that He, o is the First Cause, the Absolute and Infinite One, truly sts. Such a consequence has been asserted to be inherent the fundamental principle, which is the basis of Mr. Man- 's argument. But, to us, it seems that clearly it has in it such consequence, that no such inference can be drawn from

Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mansel alike maintain at no such consequences can be attached to this great prin- le; and Sir William Hamilton goes far to demonstrate that s is indeed the case. He shows generally and conclusively at man must believe in the reality of the Unconditioned, ile, nevertheless, it cannot be comprehended by him. We ote his own forcible and clear words.

The Conditioned is the mean between two extremes, exclusive of each other, her of which can be conceived *as possible*, but of which, on the principle of tradiction, one must be admitted *as necessary*. On this opinion, therefore, rea- is shown to be weak, but not deceitful. The mind is not represented as con- ing two propositions subversive of each other as equally possible; but only as ble to understand as possible, either of two extremes; one of which, however, he ground of their mutual contradiction, it is compelled to recognize as true. are thus taught the salutary lesson, that the capacity of thought is not to be stituted into the measure of existence; and are warned from recognizing the ain of our knowledge as necessarily co-extensive with the horizon of our faith. l by a wonderful revelation, we are thus, in the very consciousness of our ina- y to conceive aught beyond the relative and the finite, inspired with a belief in existence of something unconditioned beyond the sphere of all comprehensible ity."

nd again, "The sphere of our belief is much more extensive than the sphere of knowledge; and, therefore, when I deny that the Infinite can, by us, be *known*, n far from denying that by us it is, must, and ought to be, *believed*. This I e indeed anxiously evinced, both by reasoning and authority. When, therefore, maintain, that, in denying to man any positive cognizance of the Infinite, I vir- lly extenuate his belief in the infinitude of Deity, I must hold you to be wholly ng, in respect both of my opinion, and of the theological dogma itself. Assu- ly, I maintain, that an Infinite God cannot be by us (positively) comprehended. the Scriptures, and all theologians worthy of the name, assert the same. Some

indeed of the latter, and, among them, some of the most illustrious Fathers, go the length of asserting, that "an understood God is no God at all," and that "if we maintain God to be as we can think that He is, we blaspheme." Hence the assertion of Augustine; "Deum potius ignorantia quam scientia attingi."

And, in like manner, Mr. Mansel says, "The Infinite is known to human reason merely as the negation of the Finite; we know what it is not, and that is all. The conviction *that* an Infinite Being exists seems forced upon us by the manifest incompleteness of our finite knowledge; but we have no rational means whatever of determining *what* is the Nature of that Being."

We could wish, certainly, that Mr. Mansel had labored more than he has upon this branch of his subject, and brought out, more fully and prominently, the certainty of conviction in the human mind *that* there is an Infinite One, especially as his argument necessarily led him to make so prominent the assertion that that Infinite One cannot be comprehended by man. He would thus have obviated the objection, which is the most salient and important one that has been alleged against the validity of his argument. But, in this case, it has, doubtless, happened, as is not unusual, that a conviction, which is to us so self-evident, that we should not think of its being questioned, has been the very point of attack upon the line of thought, which took, through its whole substance, as an axiom, the very belief or conviction that has been treated as wholly inconsistent with it. Mr. Mansel, probably, did not think of reiterating that the belief in an Infinite One is a deeply planted conviction of the mind of man, because it did not occur to him that any one would question that such was his opinion.

Sir William Hamilton has shown, by a train of reasoning, that we must believe in the reality of the inconceivable, and it may also be said that such a belief is among the primitive and necessary truths, in which, by the very constitution of our minds, we are compelled to believe. Such truths there are. The analysis, by which the belief in such truths was shown to be a property of the mind, was perfected by Leibnitz; and the establishment of it may be regarded as an important advance in philosophy. The well known illustration, by which Leibnitz sets forth this property of the human mind, will bear repetition.

"In illustration of this, let me make use likewise of the simile of a block of marble, which has veins, rather than a block of marble wholly uniform, or of blank

tablets, that is to say, what is called a *tabula rasa* by philosophers; for if the mind resembled these blank tablets, truths would be in us, as the figure of Hercules is in a piece of marble, when the marble is altogether indifferent to the reception of this figure or of any other. Bnt if we suppose that there are veins in the stone, which would mark out the figure of Hercules by preference to other figures, this stone would be more determined thereunto, and Hercules would exist there, innately in a certain sort; although it would require labor to discover the veins, and to clear them by polishing and the removal of all that prevents their manifestation. It is thus that ideas and truths are innate in us; like our inclinations, dispositions, natural habitudes or virtualities, and not as actions; although these virtualities be always accompanied by some corresponding actions, frequently, however, unperceived."

The recognition of such native convictions of the human mind may be considered an established principle of Philosophy; which has to it the witness of philosophers of all ages and systems; as is shewn, for example, in the rich Catena, which Sir William Hamilton has included in his edition of the works of Dr. Reid. The belief in time and space, and in the reality of existence out of time and space, the acceptance of mathematical axioms, the ideas of Right and Moral obligation, of Beauty and of Sublimity, are among these primitive and necessary beliefs, and convictions and instincts. In the following noble passage of Muretus, taken from Sir William Hamilton's Catena, the value and necessary truth of these primitive beliefs are admirably set forth. We translate from the Latin of Muretus.

"Neither should we be concerned, though we may not be able to prove these things, except by arguments drawn from Nature, and though perhaps we may not be able to confute some reasonings of those, who maintain the contrary opinions. For the Natural Consent of all Nations ought to have much more weight with us, than all the arguments of these men. Nor is warring with the Gods, after the manner of the Giants, anything else than resisting Nature, and wishing to subvert, by acute and fallacious conclusions, the opinions implanted by her in the minds of all men. Therefore, as those old men of the Trojans, in Homer, said that Helen was beautiful, without doubt, but must, nevertheless, be sent back to her own people, lest she should be the ruin of the State; so we, if, at any time, any acute argument is brought to us by these men, from which it may be gathered * * * * that souls die together with bodies, or if aught remains of them, it is something common to the race, and that as there is one sun, so there is one soul of all men, * * * * let us answer; You are truly ingenious, my good sir, and erudite, and powerful in disputation, but keep to yourself those excellent reasons of yours. I am unwilling to admit them into my mind, lest they be ruinous to me. For, my most worshipful masters, most studious youth, take to yourselves the opinion, no-

ble and worthy of immortal remembrance, of that consummate philospher, Aristotle, that you may hold it fast in all disputations of this kind, and follow it, and regulate your sentiments and your thoughts by it continually. For, from the breast of that divine man, as if from a most august sanctuary of wisdom, these words proceeded, which are read in his first book of Ethics, ad Eudemum. *Προσέχειν οὐ δεῖ πάντα τοῖς διὰ τῶν λόγων ἀλλὰ πολλάκις μᾶλλον τοῖς φαινομένοις.* I will render them into the Latin tongue, and would that I could render them into all languages of all people, and engrave them in the minds of all men, so that they might never be obliterated. '*Not always nor in all things should assent be given to those propositions, which are proved by reasons and arguments; yea, rather, those things are for the most part to be held, which are approved by the common opinion of men.*' For, what is so false and so abhorrent from the truth, that arguments to prove it cannot be invented by ingenious and practised men? * * * * Have you ever seen in a dark night some lighted torch shining from afar? You saw it, therefore, though it was remote from you; nor yet could you see anything in that long space, encumbered with thick darkness, interposed between your eye and the torch. Imagine the same things to happen to your minds. Often our mind sees the truth of some enunciation, shining and giving light as from a distance, although on account of that darkness with which the mind is enveloped, it cannot see the things which are intermediate, and by which that truth is reached. If about to set forth on a journey, you should see two ways leading to the same point, one of them easy, plain, safe and conducting where you have determined to go, without any aberration; the other tortuous, rough, dangerous, and from which those, who might travel upon it, might often wander, by reason of various and manifold windings of the path, would you doubt which way to choose? There are two ways, by which men think that they can arrive at some knowledge of God and of their own rational nature. For they either strive to reach it by disputation and by subtle inquiry, why anything is as it is; or by assenting without any doubt to those things, which the ancients have handed down with the most perfect consent, things, which have partly been known by the light of Nature, partly delivered by divine inspiration. Those, who have traveled upon the first path, have fallen, in all ages, into manifold errors. But the other path is marked by the footsteps of them whom we venerate and honor as translated to Heaven."

Now the conviction of the existence of God our Creator may be considered to be one of these primitive convictions of the mind of man. Though the outward creation may awaken this belief, yet God has written the truth of His own Personal existence upon the intelligent, free, and moral nature of man, as truly as the figure would be marked out in the veins of the marble in the illustration quoted from Leibnitz, as Phidias is said to have so incorporated his own name with his master-piece, that its erasure would be the destruction of the statue. Outward Nature, with its necessary laws, would not demonstrate the existence of a Free Intelligence, Who is unchangeably

ıe and Just and Holy. This proof is to be found in the ıitual nature of man. It is well and admirably stated in Second Lecture of Sir William Hamilton. The limits of Article forbid the drawing out of this argument in extenso. ı can but allude to it.

We quote, however, an admirable passage from Jacobi, which William Hamilton has inserted in his Lecture.

> But is it unreasonable to confess, that we believe in God, not by reason of the ıre (that is, the world of matter) which conceals Him, but by reason of the su-atural in man, which alone reveals and proves Him to exist? *Nature conceals ;* for, through her whole domain, Nature reveals only fate, only an indissoluble n of mere efficient causes, without beginning and without end, excluding, with ıl necessity, both providence and chance. An independent agency, a free ori-ıl commencement within her sphere, and proceeding from her powers, is abso-ly impossible. Working without will, she takes counsel neither of the good of the beautiful; creating nothing, she casts up from her dark abyss only eter-transformations of herself, unconsciously and without an end; furthering, with same ceaseless industry, decline and increase, death and life,—never lucing what alone is of God and what supposes liberty,—the virtuous, the ortal. *Man reveals God;* for man, by his intelligence, rises above nature, in virtue of this intelligence is conscious of himself as a power, not only inde-dent of, but opposed to, nature, and capable of resisting, conquering, and con-ing her. As man has a living faith in this power, superior to nature, which lls in him; so has he a belief in God, a feeling, an experience of His existence. he does not believe in this power, so does he not believe in God; he sees, he ɔriences naught in existence but nature,—necessity,—fate."

So do we come to believe in God. He, who made us, has ıtten deeply the proof of His Being in our Nature, and not we deny *that* in its freedom, its intelligence, its moral ac-ıntability, not till we deny ourselves, as God has made us, ı we refuse to believe that God is. We must believe, there-e, in the reality of a First Cause freely acting, who is a per-ı, Absolute in His Perfection, Infinite in His Nature. But, this His absolute existence, and the infinitude of His Nature, cannot see Him, or comprehend Him. And though we ıst believe Him to be the First Cause, Whose effect is the ɔated Universe, yet, *how* He is that Cause, we cannot under-nd,—what the connection is between that Infinite, Absolute use, and the finite Creation,—what the connection is be-ɔen a Universe, which exists in time and space, and Him the rst Cause and Creator, whose existence is neither in time nor

space, this we cannot discern or comprehend; much less can we comprehend, at all, an existence, which is neither in time nor space, and yet, in the reality of such an existence we do and must believe.

The truth is, we know God only in *His Relation* to the Universe and to ourselves,—only within the bounds of time and space and of the finite creation; and therefore we know Him not and cannot know Him, as He is in His own Absolute Existence and His Infinite Nature. And the attempt so to know Him only involves us in the inextricable contradictions and difficulties, which Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mansel have so well exposed. The former pertinently says, "we are unable to think the Divine Attributes as in themselves they are. We cannot think God without impiety, unless we also implicitly confess our impotence to think Him worthily; and if we should assert that God is as we think or can affirm Him to be, we actually blaspheme. For the Deity is adequately inconceivable, is adequately ineffable; since human thought and human language are equally incompetent to His Infinities."

And, in fact, this representation of the incomprehensibility of His Being is that which is made in the Scriptures, "No man," we are told "hath seen God at any time." "He dwelleth in the light, to which no man can approach." "His ways are unsearchable, and His judgments past finding out," how much more inscrutable must be His essence. *Because* this is so unsearchable, His ways and procedures are so incomprehensible by man. We must believe much about them which we cannot solve. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than Hell; what canst thou know?" Such are the testimonies of Scripture, confirming the conclusions of a sound philosophy, declaring to man that a perfect or an adequate knowledge of God, as He is, is not attainable by man. For here "we know in part," and therefore we know not that infinitude of God, of which a part cannot be predicated.

But yet He is revealed to us, so far as we are capable of receiving and understanding the revelation. But as we thus

know him, it is in His relation to His creation and to ourselves. Throughout His universe there are reflections and images of His glory, from which we learn to believe that that glory is transcendent beyond our power of comprehension. The very highest revelation which God has made of Himself to man is a revelation of Him under a limitation specially suited to our circumstances and capacity.

So does He make Himself known to us in the face of Jesus Christ, through the medium of that humanity which we ourselves possess. The knowledge which He gives us concerning His attributes and ways, is given, therefore, by way of analogy and representation. It is knowledge well suited to fill us with a deep sense of His greatness and glory and goodness, to inspire us with a profound impression of the Infinite excellence and the Absolute perfection of His Attributes and Being, but not to enable us to discern these attributes, as they are, in their own fulness, much less to discern or comprehend the Nature, Whose attributes they are.

The most profound metaphysician, the most far-seeing statesman may be known and loved and admired, in all the tenderness of life, in all the transparency of a pure and righteous and beneficent character, by his family and his familiar friends, who, nevertheless, know not the metaphysician in the depths of his speculation, or the statesman in the largeness of his views and the complexity of his plans. The heart of kings is unsearchable, but the justice of their procedures and the beneficence of their sway may be made apparent to the humblest of their subjects. The lives and fortunes of men, of the criminal trembling at the bar, of one who is unjustly accused, or whose intellectual sanity is in question, are often placed in the balance of principles of law and justice and expediency, which they cannot comprehend; are exposed to the hazard of subtle disquisitions, whose windings they can, by no means, follow. These, and such like analogies of our earthly life, set forth to us how we may know God as our Loving Father and our beneficent Redeemer, how we may appreciate, and know, and love Him in the relations in which He manifests Himself

to us, though we cannot know Him in his Infinite and Absolute Being.

We have revelations concerning Him, which are intended to have a powerful practical influence upon us, to be the light, by which we regulate our conduct and our steps in all the course of our earthly pilgrimage, to be the fountain-light of all our seeing, so that, though in the world, we may, nevertheless, walk in the light which is reflected from the throne of God. The knowledge which we have concerning God is well fitted to nourish faith and obedience, and to call forth love and devotion, to place us in that condition of instruction and discipline, which may prepare us for the clearer and fuller knowledge which can be imparted only in a future state of being. In the language of Hooker distinguishing between the Infinite Being of God and His revelation of Himself to us under finite forms and relations; "If therefore it be demanded, why God, having power and ability Infinite, the effects notwithstanding of that power are all so limited as we see they are, the reason hereof is the end, which He hath proposed, and the law whereby His wisdom hath stinted the effects of His power in such sort, that it doth not work infinitely, but correspondently with that end for which it worketh, even all things χρηστῶς, in most decent and comely sort, all things in Measure, Number and Weight."

Truly then, as Mr. Mansel has said and shown in manifold and various applications to the objects of religious thought, and as the judicious Mr. Hooker hath pregnantly and well said before him, "our soundest knowledge is, to know that we know Him not as indeed He is, neither can know Him, and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach. He is above, and we upon earth, therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few."

But the knowledge concerning Him conveyed under earthly forms, and finite relations, such as we are capable of receiving, addresses itself to our nature and to all parts of that nature as it has come from the hand of our Creator, to our intellect,

our affections, and our active powers. It is a Revelation which enlightens us, and which moves us, and which is fitted, as no other address can be, to be the regulator and guide of our lives, through this world of images and shadows to a nearer and clearer view of that light to which now no man can approach. For it doth not and cannot yet appear what we shall be; but, when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. What enlargement and development of our faculties there may be, what faculties appertaining to that life, which is hid with Christ in God, may then be awakened, how near a created being can approach to a perception of the Perfect and the Infinite One we cannot here either see or imagine. "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." Here we have but glimpses and reflections of that glory. So to know God here is life, and joy to make mention of His Name, but in the vision of God, as now we can neither attain nor conceive it, is to be realized the fullness of our being. "When I awake up after Thy Likeness, I shall be satisfied with it." Such is the consummation, so to be sought and reached, which is presented to us by sound philosophy accepting the lessons of true religion.

In the eloquent words of Mr. Mansel, who maintains, most clearly and explicitly, the adaptation of God's revelation of Himself to our nature and needs and circumstances, as we ourselves can see and appreciate them;

"The luminary, by whose influence the ebb and flow of man's moral being is regulated, moves around and along with man's little world, in a regular and bounded orbit; one side, and one side only, looks downward upon its earthly centre; the other which we see not, is ever turned upwards to the all-surrounding Infinite. And those tides have their seasons of rise and fall, their places of strength and weakness; and that light waxes and wanes with the growth or decay of man's mental and moral and religious culture; and its borrowed rays seem at times to shine as with their own lustre, in rivalry, even in opposition to the source from which they emanate. Yet is that light still but a faint and partial reflection of the hidden glories of the Sun of Righteousness, waiting but the brighter illumination of His presence, to fade and be swallowed up in the full blaze of the Heaven kindling around it; not cast down indeed from its orbit, nor shorn of its true brightness and influence, but still felt and acknowledged in its real existence and power, in the memory of the past discipline, in the product of the present perfectness, though now distinct no more, but vanishing from sight to be made

One with the Glory that beams from the "Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

This will be the solution of the mysteries of our being. The highest office of Philosophy is to fix the limits of human knowledge; to demonstrate to man the necessity of his ignorance. Its last result, in the words of a distinguished philosopher,* is, "to derive ignorance from its most elevated source;" to subject the Reason of man to the Infinite Wisdom above him, which he cannot fathom; its crowning act and glory is to transfer man, with its own hand, from the borders of its domain, to the province of Divine Faith. Under this guidance only, walking by faith and not by sight, can he come to the light, which now he cannot approach, to the presence of God, "Whom," in the boundaries of time, "no man hath seen nor can see."

* M. Royer Collard.

Art. II.—GEORGE SHALL YERGER.

Among the fruits of faith which modern times have witnessed, there are few upon which we can dwell with more satisfaction than those which are afforded in the life, the character, and the services to the Church of one who has recently entered into his rest; and whose name will ever be cherished and revered in the Diocese, to the interests of which the strength of his Christian manhood was given, as the "Great and good Layman of Mississippi."

We feel it to be no ordinary privilege to have such a life to record, such a character to delineate. It not only shows us of what our nature is capable, through the Faith of the Gospel and the training of the Church; it not only certifies, on the ground of the actual experience of an unimpeachable witness, to the great value of that Divine System of Faith, worship and discipline, which has been transmitted to us from the beginning; but it also affords a beautiful illustration of what is meant by Lay-cöoperation, as we see how much one Churchman may accomplish in the course of his single life.

In recalling the memory of that sainted man, whose name heads this Article, it is impossible not to be so impressed with the known and beautiful simplicity of his life and character, as to be restrained from every thing like common-place eulogy. Indeed, it is not for those among whom his holy and useful life was spent, that these lines are written. To them his daily walk and conversation was a living epistle, speaking far better things than any that can be said of him. In all the tributes to his memory, by the various public bodies with which he was in any way connected, there has not been an expression, however strong, that has exceeded, or indeed given adequate utterance to, the deep sense of his worth, which was entertained by the whole community. Political rancor, and even sectarian animosity, were suspended in the involuntary and universal admiration of a character that was above reproach, and of a life which was spent in doing good. When his Bishop spoke of him

in Convention as "that best of men," when his pastor declared to the assembled community, which for a season seemed to forget everything else, in the grief of what each and every one felt to be a personal bereavement, that "if Christian perfection were ever reached on earth, it had been attained by him," there was not a dissenting thought. Every one felt that, however upon ordinary funeral occasions such language might seem like overstrained eulogy, as applied to Mr. Yerger it was but simple truth.

But we write for those who knew him not, to turn to some good account the example of this remarkable man. We know that where he lived, there are those, who, by the holy light of his influence, have been led to follow him as he followed Christ; we would widen the circle of such an influence. Though dead, we would have him to speak for the encouragement and strengthening of his brethren of the Laity, that through the same means which he employed they may attain to the same precious faith and distinguished usefulness. We would commend to them the example of his earnest devotion to the cause of his Divine Master. Could the zeal and unwearied energy which animated this Christian brother, be infused into the hearts of those who form the great body of the Church, and upon whose hearty cöoperation the efficiency of the clergy must mainly depend, could their time and their affections, their genius and their learning, their wealth and their influence, all be thus consecrated, what results would not follow, and to what growth and prosperity would not the Church attain!

George Shall Yerger was born in Hagerstown, Maryland, A. D., 1801.

While yet a youth, he removed with his parents to Lebanon, in the State of Tennessee. Even at that early period, the noble qualities which distinguished him in after life, were developed in no ordinary degree, and attracted to him no little attention. His devotion to his parents, his obliging disposition, his great industry, no less than his remarkable intelligence, gained him many friends. Even then he formed the habit, which never forsook him, of doing thoroughly whatever was worth doing at all. Whatever he undertook he did to the best

of his ability, and with all his might. While yet in his minority, and employed in a store at Nashville, he was urged by Judge Trimble, whose powers of observation had discerned something of what his young friend was capable of becoming, to apply himself to the study of Law. To do this, under the circumstances which surrounded him, was indeed difficult. But he had even then trained himself to laborious self-denial, and the obstacles, which would have disheartened one of less untiring energy, only stimulated him to fresh exertion. Upon being admitted to practice, he settled in Nashville, and soon after married Miss Sally M. Scott, the daughter of an eminent Judge of Knoxville ; (she and their six children survive Mr. Yerger.) His success at the Nashville Bar was rapid and complete. Whether this was more owing to his great logical force, or to his rare powers of application and thoroughness in whatever he undertook, it is difficult to say. Both of these qualities he possessed in an eminent degree, combined with many others ; all of which united to render him one of the most distinguished and successful lawyers in the whole country.

After attaining, while yet comparatively a young man, to the highest distinction that his Profession could bestow, he removed from Tennessee, about twenty years ago, to the State of Mississippi ; residing first in Vicksburg, and afterward, to the day of his death, in Jackson. These years were spent in the active practice of the Law; and here he achieved the highest and most enduring triumphs of this noble profession, sustaining to the last " the reputation of a lawyer of unsurpassed learning and ability."

All other distinctions, however, seem now as nothing, in the lustre of another trait in his personal character—his rare goodness. Affection, admiration, and even veneration, were cherished toward him by all who were ever brought within the circle of his influence. As a counsellor in difficulty, a friend in need, he was continually approached by those needing guidance or assistance. And never was an appeal of this kind made to him in vain. It was the great happiness of his life to give, and he realized to the full the blessedness of the cheerful giver. He gave so wisely, too, that the confidence in his kindness of

heart, was fully equaled by that reposed in his judgment. Hence, the influence for good which he exerted, far beyond the intrinsic value of his own contributions. For, whatever had the stamp of his approval was thus commended to universal favor; and by this means, his offerings to objects of public utility, and his charities to the destitute, were multiplied an hundred fold.

As an arbiter of differences, a healer of breaches, a peace-maker, who can tell the amount of evil which he was instrumental in preventing! How many confidences, vital in their issues, which could be entrusted to no one else, have been entrusted to him! How many times has the blessing of him that was ready to perish come upon him! How many ruined fortunes has he helped to repair; how many homes has he kept from being broken up; how many widows and orphans has he befriended; of how many men was he the strongest earthly support! And yet his charity, like the blessed dew from Heaven, was so silently diffused, that it was only seen in its effects, and so great was his modesty, that while he lived no opportunity could be found for giving expression to the estimation in which he was held.

When, however, the news of his death reached his friends and neighbors, who that witnessed it can ever forget the gloom which overshadowed the whole community, and the grief which poured itself forth in one general burst of lamentation. The following extract from one of the Newspapers of the day conveys but a faint impression of the scene which was witnessed in Jackson on the day of his funeral.

"The Hon. George S. Yerger departed this life on the 20th day of April, 1860. His funeral obsequies took place from his late residence in Jackson, Miss., on the 23rd inst., between the hours of 12 and 1 o'clock. It was a solemn occasion, and well calculated to excite the tenderest emotions of the human heart. Truly has a great man fallen in Israel! The Mayor and Common Council of the City, clothed in emblems of sorrow, attended his remains in company with distinguished pall-bearers to the grave. Political Conventions adjourned—Judicial business was suspended—all business closed! The Judges of the Supreme Court, the high functionaries of State and Church—delegations from neighboring cities and towns were there—members of all denominations of Christians—the old and the young—the high and the low—the widow and the fatherless, the bond and the free, had assembled together, to bestow the last sad offices to the memory of a noble spirit. The military,

with rifles and muffled drum, mingled their tears of grief with the vast multitude, as they marched in solemn grandeur, under the sound of tolling bells, to the last resting place of the distinguished dead."

Volumes might be filled with the notices of Mr. Yerger, which his death called forth. One of them, from the Nashville Bar, shows that after the lapse of twenty years there was no abatement in the regard which was cherished for him while he resided in that city; and none can fail to see in them the evidences of genuine feeling, and of profound grief at his loss.

But it is time that we refer more particularly to the graces of our departed friend's character.

And first, of his faith. This was based upon a careful investigation of the Evidences of Christianity, by a mind that was eminently practical, and peculiarly rigid in its demands. With almost unequaled resources, derived from long habits of strict research, he gave the full strength of his capacious and indefatigable intellect to the pursuit of Divine Truth; and the result was such a faith as is rarely realized. He was absolutely convinced of the truth of Revelation, and realized it as fully and as practically as his own existence. This conviction, indeed, pervaded his very being, and made him what he was. Never doubting for a moment, he never faltered or desponded. This, unquestionably, was the great secret of his buoyant, courageous, cheerful Christian character. Not that he at once found peace and joy in believing in Christ. The sense of guilt, the conviction of the necessarily appalling consequences of sin against a just and holy God, were strong and deep within him. But when at length his soul was fully opened to the vision of Calvary, he felt that the great Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross sufficed for the whole penalty of transgression, and that to those who were in CHRIST JESUS, there could be no condemnation. Thenceforth, the love of his adorable Redeemer became the one engrossing affection of his whole being; and his whole life went out in living streams of gratitude and devotion, disposing him to the habitual and unconstrained performance of every Christian duty.

His CHURCHMANSHIP was but the unfolding and embodiment of his faith. In embracing the Gospel, he embraced it

in its entirety, its doctrines, its precepts, and its ordinances. To his sagacious mind, the Gospel of Christ could no more be separated from the Church of Christ, than the soul from the body. Not only was the Church its Witness and Keeper, but its dispenser also. It was only through the Church that he could be brought into actual, realized, certified relations to the God whom he worshipped and adored, and enabled both to perform the conditions of salvation, and have the Seal of the well ordered and sure Covenant applied to his own soul. The same process of investigation and reasoning, which made him a true believer, made him also a conscientious and loyal Churchman. The duty to receive the Sacraments and other ordinances implied the existence, somewhere, of the power to administer them. The questions then for him to settle were these; to whom was the authority committed? how was it to be transmitted? and where is it now to be found? Few, even among the clergy, have given to the subject which these questions involve, a more careful and prolonged scrutiny than Mr. Yerger devoted to it. He never bestowed more thought and labor upon his most important legal *briefs*, than he gave to the papers which he prepared in the course of this investigation. Some of these arguments have been published, and have done good service to the Church, and many more which remain in manuscript are well worthy of publication, and of the widest diffusion. Impressed with the conviction, that whatever matters might have been left to be settled by men, the administration of the Gospel of Christ, involving, as it does, its very being, must needs be settled by God Himself; and deferring not to human reason, but solely to divine authority and guidance, he searched the Scriptures and the primitive records, diligently, to find out what, and where, the Church was at the beginning; and then tracing the divine organization, through "the ages all along," down to his own day, the result was a complete identification in its History, its Faith, its Worship, its Ministry and its Sacraments, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country with "The Holy Catholic Church" acknowledged in the Creed. The fact that the Church of Christ, as a Spiritual Kingdom, with its divinely enacted laws and regulations, and

its divinely appointed officers to execute them, has been transmitted to us in its completeness as a Divine System, Mr. Yerger held to be as firmly established as any fact in history, and as susceptible of proof. He believed, also, quite as firmly, that in the use of the Book of Common Prayer, he not only joined in the worship of the English Reformers, but in the worship, in all its essential features, of the Holy Church throughout the world in the primitive and Apostolic ages. Hence, everything like novelty in the discipline and worship of the Church, he held to be as inadmissible as novelties in Christian Doctrine; and he took his stand, once for all, with the Prayer Book as it is, believing that in it are embodied all that the teachings of Scripture and the united testimony of the first ages of Christianity declare to be really authoritative and binding.

Let it be carefully remembered in this connection, that these results were wholly independent of everything like a predilection for what we call the Church System. So far from inheriting an attachment to the Church, he had no early acquaintance with it whatever; nor was it until he had fully mastered the Evidences of Christianity, and had experienced the constraining love of Christ moving him to make "confession unto salvation," that the question of authority in the Ministry of reconciliation engrossed his mind. If any pride of opinion, or sectarian bias, or family feeling and interest moved him, it is very certain that it was not in the direction of the Church. It was in trying to ascertain the clear line of his own duty, and to avail himself of the divinely appointed Channels of Grace, that he searched the Scriptures and the earliest ecclesiastical records, for the primitive Christian System; and the result was, an unshaken confidence in that Ministry, which has been transmitted in due succession "from the Apostles' time," and an equally firm conviction, that, in all essentials, the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States holds nothing more and nothing less than what was held in the purest ages of Christianity.

Hence the comfort and satisfaction which our lamented friend took in all the Church's ministrations. They were to him no mere forms, but acts performed in the name of Christ, and ac-

companied by the power of the Blessed Spirit of God. The Church, in which he statedly worshipped, was to him none other than the House of God, and the very gate of Heaven. He always entered its hallowed courts with the feeling of one going into the realized presence of the Most High. He confessed his sins as one who knelt at the Saviour's feet. He heard that Divine Saviour's voice in the Absolution, and rose up with the consciousness that GOD, through His ministering servant, had declared to him words of pardon and peace. His approaches to the Holy Communion, he made the great occasions of his life. The last time in which it was his privilege to partake of the Sacred Feast, was on Easter. One who left the chancel rail just as Mr. Yerger approached it, describes the expression of his countenance as absolutely heavenly. No time can ever efface the remembrance of that rapt look of joy and peace. We mention these things, because they prove that a reverential regard for the holy mysteries of our religion, is far from being necessarily associated with a dry and cold formality. Let any one know the Church as well as Mr. Yerger did, and from the same concentration of thought and careful study, let any one love it as devoutly, and commit himself as sincerely to all its teachings and influences, and he cannot fail to find it a precious reality, full of life, comfort, and power.

It is because so many only give it their partial confidence, and regard it as something apart from their personal religious life, that they fail to profit, as they might, by its deep, all-pervading spirituality. Let it not be forgotten that there was hardly a spot on earth more familiarized with his presence, than the house of God; that it was the very home of his soul, where he refreshed his spirit from the wordly toils and cares which crowded thick upon him; that, when hundreds of miles from home, he would travel all night for the privilege of worshipping within its courts; that, although at the head of his profession, engaged almost constantly in conducting cases of the utmost importance, yet the week-day summons to public Worship was always paramount to all other calls; that his presence could always be counted on,—unless, as was very rarely the case, he was absolutely hindered, and it will at

nce be perceived, that we are describing a Churchman of a ery uncommon character.

And here again we remark, that what made him so differnt from most men was the fact, that his religion was a reality. t would have done any one good to witness his surprised look, hen asked whether he was never troubled with doubts in reard to his religion, and to have heard his emphatic answer, never for a moment." He had pondered these things long nd well. He had studied them, as they are rarely studied, ven by clergymen. He knew and was persuaded, and could ive, not a reason only, but the absolute proof for them all. nd on this basis of conviction, through the Grace most diliently sought for, and most carefully improved, he raised the uperstructure of a faith which was the very "substance of hings hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." It was ke to that overcoming faith which made the saints of old at nce so valiant and so joyful. It enabled him to look out from he world, and to endure as seeing Him Who is invisible. Not nly did he continually look unto Jesus, but he followed his)ivine Lord and Master, treading closely in His blessed footteps, and glorying only in the Cross. Even the most casual bserver could not fail to notice, that, without the least affecation of singularity, he was not conformed to this world, but rew all the strength and force of his character from hidden)urces, as a member of Christ's Mystical Body. With everyhing to flatter and allure him,—with all that wealth, distinction, great popularity and personal influence could do to draw im off from spiritual to temporal things, his Christian loylty remained unshaken. All this, for one engrossed in public fe, encountering, as must needs be, almost daily contradicions from those whose opinions, *code*, and customs differed so idely from the spirit and laws of that Spiritual Kingdom to hich he owned allegiance, shows conclusively what manner of an he was, and to what true heroism he had attained. So uch firmness of principle, with so much gentleness of manner, ch real goodness and devotion, united to such profound huility and self-abasement, could only be the outgrowth of a livng faith, and the fruits of the indwelling Spirit in a soul hat stayed itself upon God.

Had he known that they were to be his last days on earth, he could have made no better improvement of them. As it was, they proved to him the final anointing of the Spirit, and in lying with Christ, in this last commemoration of His Cross and Passion, he found an entrance ministered unto him, abundantly, into the everlasting Kingdom of our LORD and SAVIOUR.

And, as he worshipped, so he worked. The strength, which was thus renewed, was all expended. When it was possible, he was always working for the Church. When released from other indispensable engagements, his thoughts, affections, and energies all flowed, without an effort, into this channel. Hence the need of a Deacon was scarcely felt in the parish to which Mr. Yerger belonged. We will venture to say, that such an instance of efficient Lay-cöoperation with pastoral labor is almost unexampled. So far as our observation has extended, it is wholly so. To his pastor he was a tower of strength. There was no service in his power, that he was not always willing and happy to render; no exertion of his great influence ever withheld, when it could serve the Church, or any member thereof; no facility for ministerial efficiency, within his command, left unfurnished. When his last pastor came into the parish, he received him as one sent to him from God. He said to him, 'You have a great work to do here, and so far as we can, we will help you to do it. Whatever tracts, books, and other requisites you desire, you have but to name. Whatever plans you form, we will help you to execute—or whatever changes in the arrangements and appointments of the Church you deem desirable for the more fit and solemn worship of God, shall be at once effected. I beg you also to give yourself no uneasiness about temporal things, either as they affect yourself or your family. We will attend to all such matters, and leave you free for God's work among us." And most nobly and fully were these promises fulfilled. Not only through his instrumentality was the pastor's life liberally insured, but mainly through his influence and exertions a commodious Rectory was also purchased, and furnished in the most complete and comfortable manner. These, however, were among the least of his works and labors of love.

In the Sunday School he was truly a model teacher. He studied his illustrations and enforced the teachings of the Church with the most earnest and affectionate persuasion. Had he been pleading with a jury for a client's life, he could not have been more absorbed and concerned than when engaged in this work. While he was himself as docile as a child, and submitted himself more entirely than any one we have ever known to pastoral guidance, he was at the same time always contriving something and doing something to give increased efficiency to the labors of his pastor; at one time preparing the way for pastoral visits and then following such visits up. In the sick chamber, and at the bed-side of death, his gentle, soothing ministrations were invaluable. Even those who shrank from the presence of a clergyman would receive him in their last hour, and thus have heard from him of the Saviour's love and mercy extended to dying penitents. Dying hands have been instinctively stretched out to this holy and compassionate man; and dying heads have sought, as their last act, to pillow themselves on his strong and faithful breast. Indeed it was dificult to induce this almost self-forgetting Christian to exercise proper prudence in regard to what concerned him personally. It was his very nature to provide for others, to give, to do, to support and to comfort.

As for his charities, and contributions, they were unceasing. Not satisfied with tithing his income, he held nothing back for himself, and needed rather to be restrained from giving. All that could be spared, from the proper maintenance of his family, of the large revenue derived from his estate and his profession, was expended in doing good. We much question whether a fruitless appeal for aid in behalf of any Church object, or for charity, was ever made to Mr. Yerger. He always responded to such calls with an open hand and a glad as well as a willing heart. This however could not be otherwise when he had already given himself so unreservedly to Christ and His Church, when there was nothing that he counted as his own, and nothing of any value in his estimation only as it could be expended in promoting the glory of God, the salvation of his own soul and the souls of his fellow creatures. If in his zeal for God, and his thoughtful care and

love for others, he failed to take proper care of himself, and if his life was thus shortened for the want of needed rest, we know full well that his repose is all the more perfect and glorious now.

And as it was in the parish to which he belonged, so it was also in his wider sphere of influence and action. In them all he came up to the full measure of his ability. What he was to his Bishop may be best told in the words of the Bishop himself, in making the announcement of his death to the Convention which met during the following week.

"George S. Yerger no longer fights by our side the good fight of faith. His warfare is accomplished, the victory won; and the hand of our Great Captain has lifted him to a place among the Principalities and Powers of a higher world! Whilst his spirit rejoices in the presence of Christ, we are left to mourn the loss of his counsel, and of that ready help in all good works which it was ever his delight to render. That hand, that tongue, that head, that heart, all so freely and so fully given to God, will walk with us no more. Oh, how plainly does your Bishop now see, that he leaned too securely, if not sinfully, upon that man, that *friend*, that almost more than brother! That strong staff is now broken, and he is sternly admonished to look, amidst his labors and trials, to something more stable than an arm of flesh. Brethren, my heart runs out after this subject and I know that the heart of each one of you answers to every throb of mine."

And while his Bishop felt thus, the following extract from their report to the Convention will serve to show how Mr. Yerger was regarded by the clergy of the whole Diocese.

"To the clergy especially it seems difficult to convey to others a sense of their feelings towards Mr. Yerger and of the relation in which he stood to them. Had he been indeed one of them, his character would still have made him beloved and his abilities respected. But from a layman, such an appreciation of their peculiar feelings and their professional character, such a deep, tender interest in their affairs, and such a real, unaffected and unfailing reverence for their office as men appointed to minister in holy things, is without a parallel in their experience."

More expressive, however, than any words, was the silent, tearful meeting together of the members of that body, which for many years had been accustomed to his presence, and to rely upon him to an extent of which all were unconscious until he was taken from them. Every one was sensible of the "mournful gap" which death had made. There was a pause in business—a weary, wistful yearning for one who, for the first time, was missing from his place,—an indisposition to go on without him; and, at every stage of the subsequent proceedings,

this embarrassed sense of want was deepened. There was indeed no interest of the diocese, with which Mr. Yerger was not identified; none of its concerns, with the details of which he had not made himself fully acquainted. And withal there was about him such an utter absence of every thing like pretension, such a respectful deference to the opinions of others, and so much Christian gentleness in enforcing his own views, that his great influence, instead of overshadowing any one, seemed to give strength and support to all.

As a Trustee of the University of the South, and of the General Theological Seminary, a member of the Board of Missions, a delegate to the General Convention; in every position, indeed, of honor and influence, in which he was called to represent the Diocese which so fully confided in him, his largeness of heart, the comprehensiveness of his views, and his disposition to work, rendered him eminently useful. It was among his most highly prized privileges to take counsel with his brethren in behalf of that Church in which he had almost merged his individual life, and to have the opportunity afforded him of advancing its interests in any way, whether at home or abroad.

A distinguished clerical deputy to the late General Convention from a remote Diocese, writes of Mr. Yerger's death in the following terms:

"The whole Church mourns the loss of one whose labors in her behalf were most highly appreciated; one whose presence in her public councils was always a pledge of wisdom, courtesy, and faithful allegiance to truth; the mature type of the Christian gentleman, able, loyal to principle, instinct with honor, and endued with the true spirit of Christian brotherhood. His influence was growing every day in the Church, and aided to sustain the hopes of all the true friends of Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order."

In the midst of his various duties and engagements, Mr. Yerger found time,—or rather took it—,to employ his vigorous pen in the cause of truth, not only in the way of an extensive correspondence with those who throughout the land were striving together for the increase of unity, liberality and efficiency among Churchmen of every class, but also as a frequent and able contributor to several of our periodicals. Indeed, at one time, in consequence of the sudden death of its clerical editor, the editorial conduct of "The Church Herald" was devolved upon

him. The emergency could in no other way be provided for, and it was met by him with his accustomed spirit of self-denying devotion. From the many articles written for this paper, an excellent manual of Church History and principles might readily be collected.

In the year 1850, when the extravagances of the then Bishop of North Carolina were doing much harm to the Church, Mr. Yerger wrote an able epistle on the subject, which he was induced to have printed for general circulation in pamphlet form, entitled "A Letter on the Doctrines of the Church in regard to Auricular Confession and Private Absolution, &c., by a Layman of Mississippi." This pamphlet is written in a most admirable spirit, and evinces great discrimination and research, and was one of the most valuable contributions to our Church literature at that trying period in our history. The vital distinction between a ministerial and declarative Absolution, as held by the Church Catholic, and a judicial and absolute Absolution, as taught by the corrupt Church of Rome, has never been more clearly set forth. The pamphlet had great influence in freeing the Church from the imputation of unsound doctrine, and in exhibiting the Scriptural character of her Offices on this most important subject.

Mr. Yerger's exquisite tenderness of feeling and delicacy of thought found frequent expression in sacred poetry. Nothing can be more touching than these effusions of his loving and devotional spirit, written to cheer his beloved ones when absent from them, to console his friends in bereavement, and to give fresh interest to some special occasions of religious worship. The last Easter Anthem sung in St. Andrew's, Jackson, was composed by him in adaptation to a beautiful and inspiriting tune, for which there were no words provided appropriate to that Festival.

Our departed brother was the member from Mississippi of the Committee on Lay-coöperation, appointed at the last meeting of the General Convention, and the subjects referred to that Committee occupied at the time of his decease a large share of his thoughts. The preliminary Address, recently put forth by that Committee, would have met with his most unqualified and emphatic sanction; for, no one could be more

averse than Mr. Yerger was to mere faction, and indeed to partyism in the Church in any shape, or more loyal to her instituted authorities. While there was no stronger advocate than he for all allowable toleration of religious opinions, at the same time he earnestly contended for unity of action in the One Body of Christ. "High" and "Low" were distinctions which he altogether ignored, believing that the use of party names, more than any thing else, tends to keep alive a party spirit. Among the points which we feel sure he would have brought before that Committee for its consideration, are the following:—

1. The importance of the older and more experienced of the laity offering themselves as teachers in the Sunday School, and for such other parish work as they may be able to perform.

2. The universal restoration of the weekly Offertory in connection with the obligation, on the part of every member of the Church, to "give as God has prospered him."

3. The increase in the number of Free Churches, that the Church ministrations may be brought within the reach of all.

4. The faithful introduction of the Church System of worship, training and instruction upon the plantations of Southern Churchmen.

5. The increase of pastoral efficiency, and the avoidance of frequent changes in pastoral relations, by the insurance of each Rector's life, and providing in every parish a furnished Rectory.

6. Frequent and regular attendance upon the week-day as well as Sunday Services of the Church.

We have extended our notice of Mr. Yerger beyond what we had designed. Our excuse must be found in the attractiveness of the character which we have thus feebly sketched.

It has been our privilege to be associated on intimate terms with some of the most earnest minds and hearts in the whole Church, but such symmetrical Christian proportions, such a holy and useful life, a nature so receptive of grace and diffusive of good, as were united in Mr. Yerger, we have never known. What confidence it gives us in the System which, when fully tried and fully lived up to, can mature such virtues and form such a character! What conclusive evidence moreover is afforded us, that even the rarest devotion to the Church and the closest living according to her method and rule, is in no wise inconsistent with the most careful attention to professional duties and secular engagements, the most complete success in life, and the highest happiness, as well in time, as in eternity.

Art. III.—LORD MACAULAY AND BISHOP BURNET.

1.—Burnet's *History of His own Time.*

2.—Baron Macaulay's *History of England.*

The late Lord Macaulay's History of England has, within a few years, placed Bishop Burnet's History of his own Time in a position, which before it had not held. It had, of course, from its first publication, attracted great attention and had been widely read. Opinions about it were divided. Swift commented, with caustic severity, on its loose, slip-shod, awkward style, and pointedly denied many of its asserted facts. Atterbury said,—we omit the profanity with which, we trust unwarrantably, tradition has garnished his remark—"He has told a great deal of truth; but where did he learn it?" Lord Dartmouth, at the end of the first volume, wrote, "I do not think he designedly published anything he believed to be false;" but added at the end of the second, "I wrote in the first volume of this book, that I did not believe the Bishop designedly published anything he believed to be false; and therefore think myself obliged to write in this, that I am fully satisfied he published many things that he knew to be so." Johnson gave as his judgment, "I do not believe that Burnet intentionally lied, but he was so much prejudiced, that he took no pains to find out the truth." The prevalent impression, however, was, and all along has been, that, without mooting the question of his honesty, small reliance could be placed on Burnet's accuracy.

Lord Macaulay—and it is, perhaps, not a remarkable line for a partizan Whig Historian to adopt—places himself in direct and unqualified opposition to this general impression. His sentence on Burnet is, "Though often misled by prejudice and passion, he was *emphatically an honest man.** Though he was not secure from the seductions of vanity, his spirit was raised

* The italics are our own.

high above the influence of cupidity or of fear." Nay, he goes even further than this, adding in a note, "It is usual to censure Burnet, as a singularly inaccurate historian; but I believe the charge to be altogether unjust. He appears to be *singularly inaccurate*, only because his narrative has been subjected to a *scrutiny, singularly severe and unfriendly.*" This last certificate of character, by the way, reminds us strongly of the Hibernian witness, who testified in behalf of a friend then on trial, that he had "frequently heard him accused of stealing, but never before knew of his being detected." Lord Macaulay's own accuracy, is, as yet, quite too entirely *sub judice*, to make his sentence on that of others final and without appeal. When that scrutiny, to which he is and will continue to be subjected, is completed, we believe the award of posterity will be, that his brilliant volumes are not History. Meantime, however, his credit is at its height, and his *dictum*, in many quarters, bears with it almost the weight of infallibility.

We propose, in a brief paper, to examine the justice of his estimate of the Bishop of Salisbury's History of his own Time; and to say what are the reasons why we decline to join in his reversal of the general opinion of its inaccuracy. We thus, at the outset, declare our own conviction, that the general opinion is the correct one, and our belief, that Lord Macaulay suffered himself to be more influenced by partisan prejudice than by sober judgment, when he arrayed himself against it.

In 1665 or 1666, Burnet, being then Minister of Saltoun, in Scotland, and twenty-three years old, "made"—to use his own words—"a *salley* that may be mentioned; since it had some relation to publick affairs." Of this "salley," and of the reasons moving him to it, he gives, in the second Book of his History of his own Time, the following account.*

"I observed the deportment of our Bishops was *in all points* so different from what became their function, that I had a more than ordinary zeal kindled within me upon it. They were not only furious against all that stood out against them, but were *very remiss in all parts of their function.* Some did

* Italics all through are our own.

not live within their dioceses; and those who did, seemed to take no care of them. They showed *no zeal against vice:* the most wicked in the county were their particular confidants: they took no pains to keep their clergy strictly to rules and to their duty. On the contrary, there was *a levity, and a carnal way of living about them,* that very much scandalized me."

All this induced him, and—presuming it to be true,—it would be enough to induce any one, to draw up a memorial of grievances. Describing this—it does not seem to have been published—he says; "I laid my foundation in the constitution of the Primitive Church: *and showed how they had departed from it, by their neglecting their dioceses,* meddling so much in secular affairs, raising their families out of the revenues of the Church, and above all, by their violent prosecuting of those who differed from them."

We do not undertake, here, to examine into the truth or falsehood of these statements; we only assert that they are clear, distinct, and unmistakeable in their testimony as to the character of the persons at that time occupying the Scottish Bishoprics. They are sweeping statements also. Only one Bishop is at all excepted—Patrick Scougall, of Aberdeen, the father of the saintly author of the "Life of God in the Soul of Man." Of him Burnet says, in connection with the passages above quoted, "There was, indeed, one Scougal, Bishop of Aberdeen, that was a man of rare temper, great piety and prudence: but I thought he was too much under Sharpe's conduct, and was at least too easy to him." With this partial exception, the whole Scottish Episcopate is merged in one vortex of condemnation. Not the Primate, Sharpe, not Alexander Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, both of whom he elsewhere singles out for special reproach, not these alone are laid under sentence, but the pious Leighton, then Bishop of Dunblane, on whom Burnet afterwards bestowed earnest, but not too earnest eulogy, and in whose favor he adds, here, not *one* exceptional word. Yet Burnet knew him; for he himself says, that he had "a course of twenty-two years intimate conversation with him;" and since Leighton died in 1684, their intimacy is

thus carried back to at least three years before the date of this attack on the Episcopacy of Scotland.

Another fact, which must be specially recollected, is, that Burnet left Scotland finally in 1674; and that, with very few exceptions, the same individuals then filled the Sees of that kingdom, who occupied them in 1665 or 1666, when the memorial quoted above was penned. The Bishops, therefore, whom Burnet knew in Scotland, must have been, with almost no exception, those whose characters that memorial professes to give.

Bearing all this in mind, we turn to Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedell, written in 1684, and published in 1685. Let our readers peruse carefully the following extract from the Preface. "I shall not add much of the Bishops that have been in that Church [the Church of Scotland] since the last re-establishment of the order, [1661] but that I have observed, *among the few of them to whom I had the honor to be known particularly, as great and as exemplary things as ever I met with in all ecclesiastical history*—not only the practice of the *strictest of all the ancient Canons*, but *a pitch of virtue and piety beyond what can fall under common imitation, or be made the measure of even the most angelical rank of men*—and saw things in them, that would look liker fair ideas, than what men clothed with flesh and blood could grow up to. But of all this I will say no more, since those that are concerned are yet alive, and their character is too singular not to make them easily known, if I enlarged upon it, as I named them." He then specially eulogizes Scougall, of Aberdeen, who had died in 1682, and adds, "And now I have done with this digression, which not being at all foreign to *my design of raising the credit due to that venerable order*, I shall make no apology for it."

It is refreshing, indeed, to find Burnet avowing, for once, such a design as he does here; for, usually, faint, very faint praise—even in the case of Ken—is all he attains to in writing of the ante-Revolution Episcopate. But is it not a little strange, that the same person should so entirely reverse the testimony, which, twenty years before, he bore to the character of the same individuals? Is it not still stranger, that, having

spoken so distinctly in 1685, he should yet leave on record that earlier testimony, to be published—so his will provided,—not sooner than six years after his death? Which of the two accounts are we to accept as historical truth? We certainly cannot accept both: one or the other must be rejected.

It may, perhaps, be said in reply, that Burnet, in his Preface to the Life of Bedell, speaks only of *surviving Bishops*. That can hardly be, for that would exclude Leighton, who died in 1684, as well as Sharpe, who was murdered in 1679. But suppose we grant it. It then becomes proper to ask, what Bishops whom Burnet knew, or could have known, in Scotland, were alive in 1685? There were but two; *James Ramsay*, consecrated Bishop of Dunblane in 1673, and translated to Ross in 1684, and *John Paterson*, consecrated Bishop of Galloway in 1674, translated to Edinburgh in 1679, and finally to the Archbishopric of Glasgow in 1687. One of these Prelates, we must observe, was consecrated in the very year when Burnet left Scotland, never to return to it, and the other in the year previous. During both these years, however, Burnet was much in England, and could hardly have then known much of them; and yet, they are, in 1685, the two Seniors of all the Bishops whom he could have known on the Scottish bench. He gives Paterson, too, elsewhere, anything but a good character.

If we go back one year, and take for the date of the Preface in question the year 1684, still, only Leighton, who had resigned Glasgow in 1674, and Alexander Burnet, who resigned the same See in 1670, and was re-instated in it in 1674, are to be added to the list of survivors. To Leighton, Burnet might without inconsistency apply the eulogium of the Preface; but, of Alexander Burnet, he says elsewhere, "He was too remiss in that which was properly his business, and which he understood to a good degree, for he took no manner of care of the spiritual part of his function." Besides, it must be remembered that, even if both these Bishops were alive when the Preface was penned, in 1684, neither of them was, when it was published, in the year following.

The contradiction, therefore, stands unrelieved by any explanation. And, without entering at all into the moral question, without considering at all the purposes which, at the different periods of his writing these two contradictory statements, may have influenced their author,* we simply call attention to their hopelessly irreconcileable inconsistency. And we say, without fear of contradiction, that the writer who could make and publish them, or cause them to be published, whether his honesty of purpose may be sound or not, stands convicted, notwithstanding Lord Macaulay's approval, as an *inaccurate* historian, and an *unsafe guide* to historical truth.

We proceed to another count in the indictment. In 1683, the Whig plot against the Government, and the Rye House plot against the person of the King, were divulged by the conscience or the fears of some of those engaged in them. Among the sufferers, were Lord William Russell, and Lord Essex. Essex committed suicide; Russell was condemned to death. With both of these Noblemen, Burnet was on terms of intimacy, but especially with the latter, whom he attended in his last hours and on the scaffold. We propose to present to our readers, his own accounts of interviews with, and conduct towards them.

And first, as to Essex. In April, 1683, some persons came from Scotland to London, to consult with the leaders of the Plot. One of them was Baillie, Burnet's cousin-german. "I went to him," says Burnet, "as soon as I heard he was come, *in great simplicity of heart*, thinking of nothing but *Carolina*.† I was only afraid they might go too much into the company of the English, and give *true representations of the state of affairs in Scotland.* [!] This might be reported about by men that would name them, and that might bring them into trouble. But a few weeks after, I found they came not to me as

* In 1665, Burnet was paying court to Lord Lauderdale, then all-powerful in Scotland, who, he assures us, "was delighted" with his "salley." In 1685, having lost all court favor, he was going to the Continent.

† A number of Scottish Presbyterians had, at this time, a plan of emigrating to Carolina; and it was under pretence of consulting about this, that the conspirators came to London.

were wont to do. And I heard they were often with Lord
all. I was apprehensive of this; and, Lord Essex being
e country, I went to warn him of the danger I feared
Russell might be brought into by this conversation [about
lina ?] with my countrymen. He diverted me from all
pprehensions, and told me I might depend on it, Lord
all would be in nothing without acquainting him. And
emed to agree with me entirely, that a rising, in the state
ich things then were, would be fatal. I always said, that
the root of the constitution was struck at to be over-
d, then I thought subjects might defend themselves; but,
ught jealousies, and fears, and particular acts of injustice,
not warrant this. He did agree with me in this. * *
though he thought the late injustice in London, and the
hat was driven at by it, did set them at liberty to look to
selves, yet he confessed things were not ripe enough yet,
that an ill laid and ill managed rising would be *our* ruin.
* * I was now very apprehensive of this."

artily do we subscribe to Burnet's sentiment, as to the
of resistance to rulers who break their constitutional ob-
ons; entirely do we sympathize with those who chafed
r the disgraceful corruptions of the Court and Cabinet of
econd Charles. But the special observation which we
to make on the passage quoted is, that—notwithstanding
ina—Burnet knew something concerning the plot, was
ed about it, and *talked of it to Essex.* No man can sup-
that he shared in it, but so much is, we think, clear from
wn words.

to Lord William Russell, Burnet gives us at great length
istory of his own conduct at the time of that Nobleman's
sonment and execution. He attended him through the
, and accompanied him to the scaffold. During the week
ding his execution, he was daily in attendance; he drew up
aper which Russell on the scaffold handed to the Sheriff;
before the Cabinet Council, he bearded King and Nobles
cause of his friend. Such is the picture presented in
et's History of his Time. It is a noble one. We see a
unflinching, faithful friend; braving the displeasure of
and Court, discharging every office of friendship, and

only pausing in his course of generous devotion, when the headless body of him, for whom he did and dared so much, was lying at his feet. The passages are too long for quotation. But, to show that we have not colored the Bishop's own representation of his conduct at this trying juncture, we quote a few sentences from his Life, appended to his History, and written by his son. "He chose rather *to sacrifice all the advantages* he might reap from that Lord's [Halifax, Lord Privy Seal] great power at Court, than to *abandon the society* of the Earl of Essex, the Lord Russell, and Sir William Jones." And again: "His behaviour at the trial of the Lord Russell, his attendance on him in prison, and afterwards upon the scaffold, at the time of his execution, the examination he underwent before the Council, in relation to that Lord's dying speech, and the boldness with which he there undertook to vindicate his memory, as also the indignation of the Court, expressed against him on that occasion, are all fully set forth in the History." We have not, then, exaggerated Burnet's representations. They, more than almost anything, have won him kindly feeling, in spite of all his foibles and fussiness, from those who have paused over this touching episode in a dreary and ignoble period, and rejoiced in the manly courage and Christian fortitude of the unjustly condemned sufferer, and the almost equal courage of his undaunted friend.

There is, however, unhappily, another picture, and a very different one, of this same subject, sketched by Burnet's own hand, to which we must now turn. A few preliminary words will be required to explain it.

One of Burnet's early friends and patrons was John Brisbane, who died, Envoy Extraordinary to Portugal, in 1684. In 1683 he was Secretary to the Admiralty, and to him, four days before Lord William Russell's execution, Burnet addressed the following Letter, which was found in the Napier charter-chest. Brisbane had married Margaret, Baroness Napier, a fact which explains the preservation of the Letter among the archives of that family. Were external evidence lacking, the internal would almost suffice to prove its genuineness.*

* We have taken the liberty to change the orthography, but nothing more.

'DEAR SIR:

I have writ the enclosed paper with as much order as the confusion I am under can allow. I leave it to you to show it to my Lord Halifax, or *the King*, [Charles II.,] as you think fit, only I beg you will do it as soon as may be, that *in case my Lord Russell sends for me*, the King may not be provoked against me by that. So, dear Sir, adieu."

"Memorandum for Mr. Brisbane."

"To let my Lord Privy Seal [Halifax] know that out of respect to him, I do not come to him. That I look on it as a great favour, that when so many houses were searched mine was not, in which, though nothing could have been found, yet it would have marked me as a suspected person. That I never was, in my whole life, under so terrible a surprise and so deep a melancholy as the dismal things these last two or three days have brought forth spread over my mind; for *God knows never so much as suspected any such thing; all* I feared was *only some rising* if the King should *happen to die:* and that *I only collected out of the obvious things* that every body sees as well as I do, and to prevent that took more pains than perhaps any man in England did, in particular with my unfortunate friends, to let them see that nothing brought in Popery so fast in Queen Mary's days as the business of L. Jane Grey, which gave it a greater advance in the first month of that reign than otherwise it is likely it would have made during her whole life. So that *I had not the least suspicion* of this matter; yet if my Lord Russell calls for my attendance now, *I cannot decline it*, but I shall do my duty with that fidelity as if any Privy Counsellor were to overhear all that shall pass between us.

I am upon this occasion positively resolved never to have any thing to do more with men of business, [!] particularly with *any in opposition to the Court*, but will divide the rest of my life between my function and a very few friends and my laboratory; and upon this I pass my word and faith to you, and, *that being given under my hand to you, I do not doubt but you will make the like engagements in my name to the King;* and I hope my L. Privy Seal will take occasion to do the like, for I think he

will believe me. I ask nor expect nothing but *only to stand clear in the King's thoughts ;* for preferment I am resolved, though I could obtain it ; but I beg not to be more under hard thoughts, especially since in all this disclosure there has not been so much occasion to name me as to give a rise for a search, and the friendship *I had* for these two [Essex then dead, and Russell] and their confidence in me in all other things, may show that they knew I was not to be spoke to in any thing *against my duty to the King.* I do beg of you that no discourse may be made of this, for it would look like a sneaking for somewhat, and you in particular know, how far that is from my heart ; therefore I need not beg of you, nor of my Lord Halifax, to judge aright of this message ; but, *if you can make the King think well of it,* and *say nothing of it,* it will be the greatest kindness you can possibly do me. I choose rather to write it than say it, both that you might have it under my hand, and that you may see *how sincere* I am in it, as also because I am now so overcharged with melancholy that I can scarce endure any company, and for two nights have not been able to sleep an hour. *One thing* you may, as you think fit, tell the King, that though I am too inconsiderable to think I can ever serve him while I am alive, yet I hope I shall be able to do it *to some purpose after I am dead ;* this you understand, [he can allude only to his history] and *I will do it with zeal ;* so, my dear friend, pity your poor melancholy friend, who was never in his whole life under so deep an affliction, for I think I shall never enjoy myself after it, and God knows, death would be now very welcome to me ; do not come near me for some time, for I cannot bear any company, only I go oft to my Lady Essex and weep with her ; and indeed *the King's carriage to her has been so great and worthy,* that it can never be too much admired, and I am sure, if ever I live to finish what you know I am about, it and all the other good things I can think of shall not want all the light I can give them. Adieu, my dear friend, and keep this a witness against me, if ever I fail in the performance of it. I am, you know, with all

the zeal and fidelity possible, your most faithful and most humble servant, G. BURNET.*

Sunday Morning, 17th July, 1683.

If Burnet's own statement that Russell, during the last week of his life, "was shut up all the mornings," and that he came to him "about noon," and "staid with him till night," means what it certainly seems to mean, then this extraordinary letter must have been written on the morning of a day, in the afternoon of which, this devoted friendship of its author immured him in the prisoners' cell. There is, therefore, no possibility of entering any explanation of its direct collision with his History, by suggesting lapse or difference of time between the penning of the two, leading to forgetfulness of facts, or change of feelings. The Letter and the History are *contemporaneous* documents. Our readers can compare them for themselves, and, the more carefully they do it, the more glaring and painful will their discrepancies appear. We do not care to pursue the comparison into details; we only suggest again, without at all entering into the *morale* of the matter, that a writer, whose recorded character of Charles II. might, *under certain circumstances*, have *been so* very different from what it is, can hardly be considered *an accurate* historian.

There were many substantial excellencies and admirable points of character in Burnet. He was a man of great industry, and exemplary in the employment of his time; his charities were so noble, that, at his death, only enough remained of the income of his Bishopric to pay his debts; he was a preacher of such power, that often, when the hour glass had run out, the congregation urged him to continue: he was unwearied in pastoral labors; he administered his Diocese with earnest care, preaching, confirming, catechising in his own Cathedral and elsewhere, and instructing Candidates for Orders, with wonderful assiduity; and yet, he utterly fails to command our confidence as a historian.

We do not undertake to explain the failure. We simply assert the fact. Whether criminally or not, we do not care to

* The Letter is printed in Napier's Montrose and the Covenanters.

say—we are willing to believe not—he was, as a historian, guilty of such gross contradictions and inconsistencies, to say the least, that, especially in cases where prejudice intervened—and with a man as much in public life as he was, where does it not intervene?—his assertions of fact, estimates of character, and auto-biographical revelations, cannot be safely accepted as historic truth, unless they are confirmed by other and extraneous testimony. This, we believe, is not only the just, but the unavoidable conclusion, from the evidence which has been adduced; a conclusion which reverses, on sufficient grounds, the judgment and decision of Lord Macaulay.

Art. IV.—SPURGEON AND HIS SERMONS.

There are two ways of reviewing—one by bringing the book before our readers—the other by portraying the author. Sometimes the latter is the most effectual. On the present occasion we shall attempt it, and give an account of our own personal recollection of Spurgeon's preaching, as we heard him a few weeks ago. Perhaps it will be more interesting to our readers than a discussion of his printed Sermons or extracts from their pages.

On a pleasant Sunday morning during October, being our last opportunity in London, we determined to hear Spurgeon, to ascertain, if possible, the secret of his success among the masses. After breakfast, therefore, we sent for the Directory in the Hotel, and, looking among the Baptist preachers, found that his Chapel was on the other side of the Thames, in Southwark.

It was a long drive, and passing Exeter Hall, though only about 10 o'clock, we saw a crowd in the street opposite the still closed doors, which showed that some celebrity was to preach there that morning. At length we reached the Baptist Chapel in New Park street, which was evidently not to be opened for service that morning, and we had the satisfaction of learning from the Sexton, who was marching about in front of the door, that Spurgeon was preaching in Exeter Hall. We found from him, that people were admitted by tickets (costing one shilling) until ten minutes before the time of beginning service, when the front doors were opened to the miscellaneous crowd, *gratis*, to get, as they best could, what seats were left, or to stand, if there were none. As it still wanted ten minutes of the time, we purchased a couple of tickets and drove back with all rapidity to Exeter Hall. Here is a copy of the ticket.

EXETER HALL, STRAND.

EARLY ADMISSION TICKET

For one Person, on

Lord's day mornings,
23d of September,
30th of September,
7th of October,
14th of October.

This ticket will admit to the body of the Hall, West Gallery, or Upper Platform, from 9–45 to 10–35, after which time the doors will be opened to the Public.

Entrance in Exeter street.

This ticket must be given up on the last date. Service to commence at a quarter before eleven.

THOMAS OLNEY.

The back of the ticket contained a list of some nineteen places at which tickets could be procured.

We arrived about three minutes before the time expired, found the whole Strand in front crowded with people waiting for the *free* entrance, and, driving round to the "Entrance in Exeter street," saw the ticket people streaming in with an equal crowd. Police officers were stationed in the street, and officers of the congregation in the passages, to make the stream divide and go in by different entrances. In we went with the rest and found the immense building nearly filled—the seats on the stage, rising one above the other, the galleries, and the floor. There must have been over 3,000 ticket people there. With difficulty we procured a seat, and had hardly done so, when 10–35 arrived, the doors were opened, and in rushed the crowd, filling up all the standing places in the passages. It is estimated there were at least 4,000 people there.

In front of the platform, immediately behind the railing, were a chair and desk for the preacher. At 10–45 he came from a door under the stage and advanced to his seat. Hith-

erto, most of the men in the congregation had been sitting with their hats on, which they now had the grace to remove. Spurgeon is a short, thick-set man, with scarcely any neck, looking like an overgrown fat boy. His hair is parted in the middle and brushed back, which necessarily gives a sort of affected, methodistical air. The first impression conveyed by a sight of his countenance is that of sensuality, and this is confirmed by a sight of his head. The fullness of the skull is behind, showing that the animal traits predominate. Then, at times, there is a self-satisfied smile lurking about his mouth, as if he felt that he was a very great man, when he looked over the mass of people who had gathered there to hear him. He had, in fact, an unctuous look, (if we may use the word,) and gave me the idea of a low bred, vulgar man, whom some popular talents had thrown up into a situation for which he had received no intellectual training. And such, we believe, is precisely the case, as he is described to us by those who know him personally.

After sitting and finding his places, he stepped to the railing by the side of his desk, raised his hand, and said—"Let us begin with a word of prayer."—"Oh, King of Israel, *this morning ascend thy throne*, and from the heights look down upon us, and stretch out the silver scepter, &c." It was a mere invocation, some three minutes in length. Then followed a Hymn, he reading a verse at a time, and the tune being set by a clerk at his side. The congregation stood during the singing, and it was quite inspiring to hear that great multitude singing together.

Then followed a prayer, about fifteen minutes long, accompanied with much gesticulation, clasping of hands and stretching out of arms. It had all the traits of other extemporaneous prayers, having more preaching than petitions in it. It began thus—"Our Father which art in Heaven. We thank thee we can call thee such. But a little while ago and we could not. We were lying in sin, &c." It was, in short, an account, addressed to his Maker, of the change which had been wrought in himself and others, its manner, progress and result. Then there was a very touching piece of humility in it about

himself. "Thou knowest, O Lord, the weakness and defects of thy servant, and how deeply he daily mourns over it himself, &c." The whole air of himself and his humbling confessions reminded one of Dickens' picture of the dissenting minister; we think it is in Bleak House.

He then took up the viii. chapter of Romans, and read a portion, giving a running commentary, which was very good; nothing peculiarly striking about it, but respectable and unexceptionable. It lasted fifteen or twenty minutes. Then followed another Hymn, and then came the text.

It was from Romans, viii.—"The Spirit witnesseth with our spirits," &c.—There were four divisions.—

I. This heirship is a special gift.

II. There must be a special proof of its existence.

III. It is a special privilege.

IV. There must be a special manner of life in those who have it.

The Sermon was a little over one hour in length, and was delivered with great volubility and animation, sometimes from behind the desk, he then walking along the front of the platform, behind the railing, eight or ten feet either side of the desk. He has no particular eloquence, and is far inferior, in his language, to Mr. Holdrich, a Wesleyan minister whom we heard in New York some twenty years ago. He cannot compare in the slightest degree with Bascom, as we remember him many years since.

What then is the secret of his success? His two traits are, a clear ringing voice and a great command of language. It is something widely different from the usual English preaching, which is characterized by an entire want of animation. The decorous school prevails there, and the majority are afraid of exhibiting any emotion or having any excitement. We do not wonder, therefore, that multitudes of the middle class, and even those below it, (for of such the majority of the congregation was composed,) are attracted by this animated style, more than by the composed manner of most English preachers.

At the same time it was far better than we had been led to expect. There was an absence of the shocking irreverence which

he sometimes exhibits, or of any attempt to produce a smile. Occasionally there were expressions out of taste, but not often. There was reference once to Don Quixote, about "Knights errant running tilts against windmills;" but from descriptions we have heard of his Sermons, we think we must have heard one of his most unexceptionable ones.

He made one bitter attack on the Church. In speaking of our Sonship, he said—"What makes you children of God? Do not answer me, in the words of the Catechism, and say—'Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven'—for this is so monstrous a lie that no one in England believes it. There may be a few, but I have never had the misfortune to meet with them. The idea, that the sprinkling of a few drops of water can make us the children of God, why, the very absurdity of the falsehood prevents it from doing extensive damage. It is only a disgrace to that matchless Liturgy, that so great a folly should so long have been retained in its pages."

This doctrine, by the way, seems to be Spurgeon's "favorite horror"—(to use Mrs. Kemble Butler's expression.) He was lately at Baden-Baden and attended the British Chapel, when the Rev. Mr. Flower preached a sermon on this subject. The British minister, the Hon. Mr. Gordon, came out afterwards in an article in the newspaper, in which he stated, that Spurgeon and a lady sat directly before him, the seats at right angles, so that Mr. Gordon had a full view of him—that his conduct was indecorous in the highest degree. During Service, he neither stood nor kneeled, opened no book, but was occupied in talking and laughing with his companion, as if they wished to show their irreverence for the place they were in. During sermon, his actions and gestures were so marked, to show his opposition, that Mr. Gordon thought, at times, he was about rising, to give a public expression of it, and, with the gentleman with him, prepared to put him out of the Chapel. His whole conduct was indecent and vulgar.

There is one point in his preaching which may conduce somewhat to his popularity with certain classes of society who follow him; it is the manner in which he will attack what may

be regarded as the peculiar aristocratic institutions of the country. This, of course, the clergy of the Church will not do. For instance, in this Sermon he took up the law of primogeniture. "We are all," said he, "'joint heirs with Jesus Christ.' All share alike, and have equal privileges. It is not as in some human governments, that the eldest son has all, though he has no more moral right than the last born, &c.. &c. But here, the last born Christian will share equally with Abel, the first martyr, &c."

Now, all this sort of talking is exceedingly palatable to certain classes of society, who are accustomed, at their political meetings, to hear denunciations of the "bloated aristocracy," and regard every institution peculiar to the country as something arrayed against their liberties. They accordingly regard Spurgeon as the people's champion, and opportunities will not be wanting, in almost any Sermon, to give a side hit at the undemocratic institutions of the country. Whether the pulpit is the place in which to win the character of a popular demagogue, is quite another question.

Now, here is a man, who, with considerable native talent, felt he *must* preach, so he began at sixteen years of age. He was just the person to need the refining moral and intellectual training of the Church. But there seems no place for him in her ranks to pursue his work, so he goes out of her and is her enemy. We need some more expansiveness in our system, to enable us to provide for such cases, in the way in which Macaulay has discussed this subject in his Review of *Ranke's History of the Popes.*

Art. V.—R. T. S. LOWELL'S POEMS.

Fresh Hearts that failed Three Thousand Years Ago; with Other Things. By the Author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay." Boston, Ticknor & Fields, 1860: pp. 121.

It is saying much for this little volume, that it is by the author of "The New Priest," and bears the impress of the same powerful hand. None but a true poet could write "Fresh Hearts that failed Three Thousand Years Ago," and the other poems found in the book here noticed. Doubtless, to constitute a poet, it is not enough to have a degree of cleverness and a certain knack of rhyming. If it were so, we should have poets in abundance, instead of the elect few, born, not made, who sit laurelled, crowned and apart, marvellously endowed and exalted above their fellows.

It is only in this select number that we see manifested that easy capability of loftiest flight, that sustained strength and sweep of pinion, which is typified in the eagle, with his soaring and imperial instinct, borne and bearing upward, calmest when highest, towering in the serene of Heaven as his proper home and rest. This buoyant quality, which comes from power, and is its sublimest expression, may nevertheless, to the undiscerning, be less impressive in its show, than that visible struggle and effort which is really the sign and token of weakness rather than strength.

To be vehement is not necessarily to be strong. Thunder is by no means the greatest of Nature's forces. It can, to be sure,

> "with sharp and sulphurous bolt,
> Split the unwedgeable and gnarled oak."

But what is that to the unintermittent actings of that quiet agency which rolls planets in their orbits, and holds the sun in its place. It is a vulgar error to be carried away with this false show of strength. Some of Byron's most admired passages are, we think, his weakest and worst. There is an acted

and artificial intensity, a sham earnestness, a visible striving for effect, a willingness seemingly to "use the heaven for thunder, nothing but thunder;" but, in spite of this tremendous pother attendant upon imprecated attempts to "wreak thought upon expression," only a feeble result is obtained. This vice of theatricality, exhibiting the mere outward grimace and not the heart of passion, however, is much oftener met with in the numerous imitators of Byron, than in Byron in himself.

We confess our own liking is for poetry of another school. That formed on classic models is, we think, far more consonant with reason and correct taste. Representations of power by the old masters of Grecian art, whether in sculpture or poetry, were invariably characterized by calmness and self-possession, suggestive of the ease rather than the difficulty with which anything was done. Now nothing can be plainer than that this is the true conception. The actor should always be made to appear greater than his act; otherwise, if his whole force seem to be expended upon it and exhausted by it, he, left empty and effete, stands forth not as an image of strength, but feebleness. That which is adapted to stimulate the imagination lies not in the actual and seen, so much as in the conjectural and possible, that which is latent and kept back, the mysterious reserves and "hidings of power." Thus, in the Apollo Belvidere, we discover nothing that is expressive of effort. If effort has been put forth, it is past, and has left no trace. All is repose, indicative of the infinite ease with which he has sped the lethal shaft in its far flight; the reigning idea pervading every part having its crowning expression in that calm look of magnificent scorn, as, watching its course, he anticipates the certain overthrow of the puny objects of his immortal vengeance. How much more impressive this, than if we saw him tugging and straining at the bow! In that case, instead of a God glorious in beauty, serene in the dignity of conscious might, we should have had a brawny and vulgar athlete, with compressed lip and knotted muscle, struggling in the attempt, rather than triumphing in the deed.

In poetry not less than sculpture, the Greeks manifested the same aversion to what was extravagant and strained. There

was an imagination which they symbolized under the image of Pegasus, who has reins as well as wings, an imagination directed by taste and controlled by judgment. They were herein taught to "acquire and beget a temperance, even in the very torrent and tempest and whirlwind of passion," not tearing it to tatters. In being thus careful "not to overstep the modesty of Nature," they were not therefore made cold and tame, for this subdued rage, operating as a fire shut up, a concealed and silent burning, wrought an incandescent calmness, more intense in its effects than roaring flame.

We cannot doubt but that language in its origin was divine, seeing a kind of inspiration characterizes all primitive utterances. In the study of words we are accustomed to grow devout, for here also, as well as in Nature, we discern the footprints of the Creator. We could as easily believe that the fossils dug out of the earth had a human genesis, as these. Vulgarized and profaned by careless tossings from lip to lip, much of their original sacredness may have been lost; and, in the mouths of ignorant and frivolous men, may have come to mean little, but, apprehended in their first import, and in the exceeding breadth of their just significance, they are spirit and life; power and beauty; knowledge and blessedness; full of the essence and soul of things; mystic, wonderful, and as we have said, divine.

The ability to discover and evolve this divine secret, locked up in the core and centre, the innermost heart of words, is a sign of the true anointing, and proclaims the Poet and Revealer. The author under review could vindicate his claim to be considered a Poet on this ground alone. To him belong those piercing and inspired intuitions which are the exclusive property of genius. He uses words, only as those can who are gifted with poetic insight into their occult powers and finer relations. Even words, it may be, debased, crusted over, trampled in the mire of a vulgar abuse, or lying undistinguished amid the rubbish of despised common-places, as lifted up by him into the sphere of poetry, and ennobled by higher relations, are seen to display hidden beauties and to flash out unsuspected splendors; thereby affording additional proof and

illustration of the fact that there is nothing in speech that is intrinsically mean or vile; and nothing so poor and prosaic but that it can be made, in proper hands, to serve the highest poetic ends.

Let it not be thought that we make too much of words, for it is, if we mistake not, in the employment of fit words fitly, that the grand secret of all good writing, whether prose or verse, mainly consists. We use many words, because we do not find the right one; but, let the right one come, and it is as the lightning out of Heaven. Night is made luminous throughout the whole circle of the mind's horizon. There must needs be a marvelous property in words, when a single one suffices to give wings to the imagination, and set the heart aflame. Thus used, it does more than define; it symbolizes. The most condensed algebraic expression is less condensed than it, but this condensation of meaning is only a part. Beyond this, it enfolds spiritual forces, having relation to other faculties besides the understanding. Altogether wonderful is it, transcending all analogy. In a drop of water, the universe perchance is mirrored, but in a word, the *Maker* of the Universe,—*God.*

It is easy to see in what school our author has learned his art. The first poem is Greek, not only as to the subject of it, but Greek also in its spirit and style of treatment. One could almost fancy it a detached melody that had floated off from some ancient lyre, which, long lost, is now recovered. If it be not poetry, we can only say, that we know not what poetry is. It seems to us to answer all the requirements of poetry in being "simple, sensuous, passionate." It is full of exemplifications of those excellencies we have been commending. One cannot read a line without feeling that the lyre vibrates to a master's touch. We give the opening verses:

> "A youth lay near the fair gulf's fringed shore;
> The noise of Corinth scarcely came so far;
> *But landward sounds, that, when the day is o'er,*
> *Tell where blest homes and ended labors are.*
> On the broad bay, behind,
> *Lugged by the lazy wind,*
> A freighted ship drew on, towards the evening-star.
>
> The little waters, as the daylight waned,
> *Lagged* up the beach, prattling with shell and stone;

The eastern sky was all with sunset stained,
Where the two heads of that great mountain shone.
Lower, each vale and glade
Drew in, to deeper shade,
The eye of him that gazed from that far shore alone.

Still lay, bright hued, in air, both far and wide,
All crumbled rays the sun had thrown away;
And, floating thick on the night's dewy tide,
Came smells more sweet than scents of burning day;
And then a voice,—as fair
As all the best things there,—
Scarce startling him; old, gentle, sweet, and sad as they:—"

hing can go beyond the entrancing loveliness of this pic-
Then how quietly it is presented! A few skillful
es, and we have the whole scene before us; not a word is
n away; not a stroke of the pen wasted. We are sooth-
d tranquilized by the place and the hour, and by each
and sound, as if present on the spot. How easy under
ircumstances to slumber! How natural to dream and
know it! The boundaries between sleeping and waking
o dim and dubious, that one cannot be quite certain
er he be on this side or that—whether the spell that binds
culties enter through eyelids open or shut. By right,
; voice, old, gentle, sweet and sad," ought not to "startle
' and the tragic story it repeats of the young hearts that fail-
long ago, would chime in so naturally with his own altered
gs, sobered by the hour, the fruit of that inevitable reac-
succeeding those hot and sanguine fancies which had oc-
l him through the day, as to excite no surprise at the pre-
uralness of the circumstance. What follows is not all alle-
It has reality for a back-ground. The poetic mountain
al mountain and rises in full view; and the climbing de-
d is literal, not metaphorical. Not that it is an ordinary
tain. An unearthly interest belongs to it. It is what
and superstition have made it. There, in the night,

" 'At times the Shades do gather,'
Shades of the great old Greeks and Barbarous men,
Whoe'er on earth hath loosed some mighty song."

ney, who should dare to visit its far and lone summits
need to have high and brave hearts.

Some Delphian children, so runs the tale, playing beside a pool, at length grow weary of their sport. Among the rest, there were 'a boy' and two maidens, one his sister. That boy was no other than the narrator, 'three-score years' agone. Not that it was really three-score years. On the contrary, we are at liberty to suppose that what is related happened full three thousand years before; and the young dreamer to have been for that matter our poet himself; but the time named serves to intimate the apparent age of the visionary personage. One of the maidens who accounted their youthful playmate a poet, said: 'Let our poet wear a Pythian crown,' and so

> "They wove the dark-leaved beech,
> *Each helping, hindering each,*
> Then in child's triumph all turned homeward to the town."

On the way they saw that,

> "On huge Parnassus hung a wondrous cloud."

and Alcestis, one of the maidens, whose young heart seems already to have some other kindred with the Boy than that of blood, repeats the legend she had heard from her mother, how at certain times in the still night there congregated the ghosts of the great masters of song, and how that then

> "What poet found the haunts of the dread throng
> On that far mountain height,
> Ere dawn was lost in light,
> *That once*, plucked fadeless flowers that to their realm belong."

The heart of the Boy, elated with his companion's praises of his 'childish rhyme,' what time they 'gazed and talked,' beat quickly at the suggestion that he, albeit a child, might climb up to that 'haunted land,' and ere they reached home it was settled, that, that very night, the ascent should be attempted. The dear devotion of their affectionate hearts, would not permit the maidens to forsake him in this enterprise of high daring; and so it is related that,

> "Ere that fair night had reached her highest bound,
> We met and grasped each other's trembling hand:
> With faltering whispers scaled the fearful ground,
> Three children where dread rocks and huge trees stand."
>
> * * * * * * *

"We kept a torrent's course, and, trembling still,
Went on and on, *starting and stopping oft:*
Sometimes we sat and wept, as children will,
And my cheek felt Evadne's, wet and soft:
'Home!' she would gently say,
'Nay!' said Alcestis, 'nay!'
And still we clambered on, through the dread woods, aloft."

igh weary and afraid, they still persevered, until, after hours of toilsome climbing,

"The mystic spot was found,
And there a high, smooth cliff, crowned with undying bloom"

ibed with the names of the 'MEN THAT WERE MAKERS;' he fond thought arose in the Boy's mind, that he could at the foot his own name. Alcestis, the wiser of the two, r heart's fresh instinct, counseled him to secure first the rs, but Evadne said, nay!

" 'Let our young poet's name
Stand on this roll of fame!' "

ieeding her, he hastened to print the stone, nor desisted, gh again and again warned by Alcestis of the approaching , and urged not to tarry. He had just sculptured the letters, 'A BOY,' but yet no name, when startled by a ger gleam of daylight, he made haste to scale the cliff;

"I tried the cliff, and climbed: my hands were sore,
And I was tired: yet I strained up the height.
The little maidens shouted, 'Yet once more!'
I tried: I tried: I could not reach them quite.
And ah! behold on high,
Ah! all across the sky,
The day was come, at last, and *dawn was lost in light.*"

late. Alas! for the young hearts that failed so long ago. ! for the thousands in every century since, that have ned ambitious dreams, and thought to make a name, and t the amaranthine flowers that bloom high up on the Paran cliffs, and dreamed the prize already within their reach, . day broke, and roused the poor dreamer to the bitter consness that it was all a dream. From this outline, some may be gathered of the structure and design of the poem. proof of no common skill, when Fable and Allegory is so tously managed as to have all the natural interest and pa-

thos of a story drawn from real life. In the present instance, we think the two lines of meaning, the obvious and the occult, are made to run happily parallel, one above the other; so that, read as a bit of tragedy, having to do with actual life, it is fitted to make the eyes moist and the heart sad; or, viewed in its other and esoteric aspect, as the vehicle of moral truth, the lesson conveyed is felt to be profoundly significant and interesting. Not only do we regard the conception as being in a high degree happy and original, but the execution as marked by uncommon power. We know, we confess, few poems in the language, which, within the same compass, contain more or greater excellences than this; and the poem that concludes the volume—'The Brave Old Ship, the Orient,' which, undeniably, is of the highest merit, not surpassed by anything the Author has written. Here, as elsewhere, we are struck with what we will venture to call his unimitativeness; in other words, his independence of reigning modes and schools of poetry. Tennyson is just now in the ascendant, and it is easy to trace the influence of his style upon almost all our recent writers of verse; but no one, we are sure, would ever know that our Author had read so much as a line of Tennyson.

We have devoted so much space to the first and leading poem of the book, that we shall be able to do little more than bestow a parting glance upon what remains. There are twenty six pieces in all, and we know not a single one that does not possess decided merit. Everywhere we see marks of the same practised hand; the same projective force of imagination, rivaling reality in the distinctness and vividness of the pictures it presents; the same original turn of thought, and freshness of imagery, and beauty of sentiment and felicity of expression; always classic and chaste; ever gentle and genial; uniformly serious and wise; from first to last severely simple, and calmly strong, and withal powerfully suggestive; with no superfluousness, no transcendental obscurities, no reigning affectations, no factitious fervers, no sickly sentimentalities, taking the place of what is healthful and manly and just in style and sentiment.

'The Days of Sin,' which is the second poem in order, is an experience brought up from the depths of an awakened con-

science, and growing out, it may be, of that vital dissection, which is wrought only by that Divine word, which is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of the joints and marrow; and in this intense form is probably confined, mostly at least, to deep and passionate natures; natures like Luther's, that have been brought into close and fearful contact with the powers of the world to come. As in his case, whose 'words were half battles,' terror and conflict resound in every syllable of this poem. We shudder as we read.

'The Little Years' is adapted to suggest Gray's 'Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College,' being similar in subject, though very different in treatment. We are quite sure that it will not suffer by comparison. 'Turning Love Away,' is a charming Anacreontic, very chaste and very classic. 'A Walk among Memory's Graves,' is sweetly elegiac and tender, mournful as the sighing of an autumnal wind, rich in melody as the nightingale singing in a wood:

> "Sweet bird; that shuns the noise of folly,
> Most musical, most melancholy."

It has a personal as well as poetical interest, inasmuch as it would seem to be drawn more or less directly from the poet's own experience, and so is adapted to give a pleasant insight into his past life and character. By various indications we recognize one who, however calm and quiet in his outward seeming, has feelings beneath of great depth and intensity,—one who early felt the stirrings of a great ambition, but upon the blooming hopes of whose early spring-time fell the swift blight of many disappointments; and leaning him back sadly, as now, upon the solemn and monumental past, he recalls the dazzling dreams of youth, and sings his dirge over buried hopes. But lapse of years, which carried away the love, hope, ambition, of that early time, brought the knowledge of their vanity, and taught him how that there was something unspeakably better than these, and worthy of the brighter and riper days:

> "The work that God has set,
> It has the long days, yet,
> And brightest of the year."

From the time he learned this truth, he tells us:

"Still has my chief work been
Rather to make me clean
As he must be that will
Go forth 'mid thronging men
And stretch his forward ken
Onward and upward, still."

Pity is it that all do not turn to such blessed account the disappointment of their early worldly hopes!

'The Painter's Probation' sets forth, in language finely poetic, how, to every human being, even the humblest, there come the celestial promptings of a call to achieve a station and a destiny more or less exalted; but more especially is this true of those gifted from their birth with lofty powers. To such

"An office is assigned
With mighty influence endowed;
And unto them Fate calleth, loud,
In the first-opening mind."

How grievous that it should be necessary, just here, to interject the sigh,

"Alas! how many, downward bowed,
Their birthright have resigned!"

Even he, however, who, fired with a lofty ambition, has been favored with seasons

"When he felt
As if the spirit, free
From the close body's narrow belt,
Swelled towards Divinity,"

somehow has retired from those very seasons, bringing no trophy. When he has stretched out his hand to seize the bright forms of perfection which floated before his vision, they eluded his grasp.

"In the wild agony of prayer
His trembling hand had tried
To fix the fleeting figure there;
And he had sought in mad despair
The power that was denied.

Alas, for the body that weighs down the spirit, and for the sin which mingles with his purest endeavors, and for waiting death only a little way off! But, weary with the struggle, it may be that death comes finally to be no longer dreaded, rather welcomed as

"A happy, fit release,

and then transformed to a more genial soil:

"the flowers of earnest thought,
That in his mind grew bright,
With fresher perfume shall be fraught
And fairer robes, of spirits caught,
Cast down in peaceful night."

'That Dead,' is a theme of the deepest pathos, very brief, but suggestive of much. What affects the mourner most, is the heedless indifference of the world, going on just as if nothing had happened; and the sight of the captive to death, delivered over to the grave to be bound fast down with bands to his head and to his feet, as if it were not enough that the dead was dead, but that, in order to make the prey sure, and the better to exclude all possibility of escape, the poor helpless clay must be subjected to the contumely of the cruel mockery of these useless precautions.

The five succeeding poems are, from their subject and design, less suited to high poetic embellishment, but are nevertheless excellent in their way, and do no dishonor to their accomplished paternity.

'The Relief of Lucknow,' works up, with great skill and power, an affecting little incident, told of a Corporal's wife, a young Scotch woman, named Jessie Brown, sick and delirious, who, towards the close of the siege, starting up from sleep, her sense of hearing made by the fever unusually acute, sent up the joyful cry; "The Highlanders! Oh! din'na ye hear the slogan?" "*The Campbells are coming!* we are saved, we are saved," &c., &c.

In 'The Dirge to a Soul Departing,' the author naturally invites a comparison with Pope in his 'Dying Christian'—but there is too little in common to run a parallel between the merits of the two. Pope acknowledges his indebtedness to the Emperor Adrian's '*Animula vagula*,' and though not mentioned by him, there is too close a resemblance between his verses and a piece by Flatman, not for him to have seen it likewise, and borrowed therefrom, containing as it does these lines:

"When on my sick-bed I languish,
Full of sorrow, full of anguish,

Fainting, gasping, trembling, crying,
Panting, groaning, speechless, dying,
Methinks I hear some gentle spirit say,
'Be not fearful, come away!' "

'The Dirge' of our author is imbued with deep lyric feeling and is capable, we doubt not, in competent hands, of the grandest musical expression. Soft and supplicatory at first, a loving voice is heard, calling upon the departing soul to look back and be allured by all that once made life glad and beautiful, not to go; and when, absorbed or averse, she hears not or heeds not the call, the pleading is renewed, interrupted by intervals of weeping stillness. But when the lips are closed, and the breast heaves feebly, and the soul struggles painfully to get free, the voice no longer entreats her stay, but bids her go, and speeds her on her way with cheerful farewells. Henceforth, changing from its low and mournful wail, it swells into exultant song, and chants the faithful soul's triumphal entrance into the joys of Paradise. 'The Year is Gone!' with its solemn retrospections and its searching introspections, its tender strain of sweet and gentle moralizings, its melodious regrets, and murmurous self-upbraidings, is in the author's very best manner.

We know of no version of 'Bürger's Lenore,' (p. 71,) and we have seen many, which does equal justice to the letter and spirit and rhythmic peculiarities of the weird and wonderful German original, as the one here given. The difficulties attendant upon the preservation of the same measure and the same form of the stanza, the retaining of the double rhymes, and, more than all, the reproducing of the imitative music in so marrying sense and sound, that this shall echo the other with ever-varying cadence—are confessedly very great, and yet we think our author has overcome them in a degree quite marvelous.

'The Barren Field,' 'Christ's Legacy,' 'A Burial Hymn,' 'To God Most High,' 'Love Disposed of,' 'To My Old Parishioners,' 'The Tempter at the Side,' 'A Rhyme read by Two Lovers,' and 'The Brave Old Ship, the Orient,' constituting the remaining pieces of the volume, are passed over, not because

they are inferior to those already noticed, for this they are not, but simply because we feel that this article is already too long and must not be extended. The last named poem we have had occasion already to speak of; and the one preceding it is, in parts at least, scarcely less admirable. What can be finer or more expressive than those four lines, which disclose the state of the two lovers' hearts in relation to each other, their deep loves read in each others' eyes, but as yet unconfessed, albeit fast verging towards confession, only some little barrier of reserve between.

> "For their deep lives have surely mined, below,
> Each toward the other, through the wall between,
> Which soon shall fall, at some slight, sudden blow,
> And one wide love be where two hearts have been."

Having found in the little volume before us so much to praise, we ought, we suppose, according to critical usage, the better to vindicate our impartiality, and at the same time to show our professional acumen, to proceed to censure; but we will venture this once to depart from this ancient custom, and close by expressing the wish that the accomplished author will ere long favor the public with further offerings of his Muse.

Art. VI.—LAYMEN'S RIGHTS.

LETTER FROM A LAYMAN.

Rev. Dr. Richardson, Editor, &c.

Sir,—I have noticed that in your Review the great proportion of your Articles on the Constitution of the Church, seem to be devoted to defending the rights of the Clergy. I do not complain of this. Very likely in such a singular state of public sentiment as exists in our country, you are doing the very thing that you ought to do. But it is worth remembering, once in a while, that the Laity have rights as well as the Clergy; and if you will allow a pretty plain-spoken man to put in his defense of his own "*Order*," (not of the Ministry, but of the Church,) you will at least gratify one of them.

The assumption of some Clergymen, that, during the regular Service in a Parish Church, they have a right to abridge the Prayers as they may think proper, together with the construction given to the opinion of the House of Bishops in relation to the Services, has induced many Laymen to ask, whether as worshipers, they have any distinct and well defined rights? Or whether they are merely at the mercy of the officiating Clergymen as to the lengthening or shortening of the Prayers? And as to the matter of the sermon? And whether, as legislators, their rights can be taken away by a mere opinion of the House of Bishops, or by the Clergyman's mere construction of that opinion?

We do not propose to dwell upon the rights that the Laity have as legislators, except incidentally. They are guaranteed by the Constitution of the American Church, and cannot be denied, nor taken away. The fact that no Canon can be passed which will bind the Laity except they consent to it, is a distinguishing feature of our Church. It greatly tends to give her the character for conservatism, which she so well deserves. Our principal object now is to say something about the rights which Laymen have in their Parish Churches, as worshipers,

who go there to pray and praise] God, and to partake of the Holy Sacrament, and to hear the Word of God read, taught, and expounded.

The first right that we claim for a Layman in his Parish Church, is a right to pray. This would seem a self-evident proposition, and one that no person can deny. Yet it is constantly denied in this country in practice; a considerable number of Clergymen are holding the contrary opinion, and acting upon it. They affirm that they have a right to say how much a Layman shall pray when he goes to Church, and that they of their own mere will can decide what Prayers the Laity shall offer up, although the Church has decided that question for them. On Communion Sunday, for instance, the Clergyman will not allow the Laity to confess their sins to God, nor offer up the Daily Prayers which the Church has given them. And he gives as a reason, that he wants to preach, and that he thinks it of more importance for the Laity to hear him preach, than for them to pray, and that it takes too much time to have all the Services. This thing takes place Sunday after Sunday, and not a few of our Clergy boldly claim the right to do it.

We have no hesitation in saying that this is a glaring attack upon the Layman's rights, and one of those daring assumptions of the Clergy, that ought to be well looked to, and thoroughly put down. To pray to God, is as well the privilege as the duty of man. In order that the Layman may do this solemnly, reverently, and in a way in which all can join, and in a language which all can understand, our Church, following antiquity, and wise primitive practice, using to a large extent the very words of the early Christians, has set forth by Canonical authority, an Order of Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, together with other Services. She calls it Common Prayer. It is common to all, high and low, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, old and young. It is common, because it is to be used by all in common, or together. The Church makes no distinction here between the king and the beggar. She admits to her pale both by the same words and the same form. She makes no difference, when, as youths, they come to her to receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. She uses the

same language when she binds them in holy matrimony. She has the same cup, the same bread, and again the same words, when she administers the Holy Communion, to refresh and strengthen them on their weary road on earth. And, at last, when they both return to dust, the beggar in his rags, the king in his royal robes, she has still the same words, the same ceremonies; for they both are but dust, to her they are but men.

By Canon, by a Law, in making which both Orders of the Clergy concurred, and to which the Laity gave their consent, thus making it binding upon all, this Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, together with the other Services, have been appointed to be used in a certain definite manner, so that there may be no mistake. Directions how, and when to read the different Services are inserted throughout the book. These directions, being made by Canon, are binding upon all who belong to the Church, and their force can only be taken away by express legislation. For a Canon or Law cannot be repealed by implication. It must be annulled or repealed by the same power which made it, and, until repealed, it remains in force. It follows, then, that no one of the parties to the making of the Canon can annul or repeal the directions of the Prayer Book. They cannot do it by legislation, for they cannot legislate alone; nor by implication or indirect action, because that will not repeal a Canon. These Offices of Prayer, &c., being set forth by the Church, the duty of reading them by the Clergy, as set forth, clearly follows. Each and every rubric, being set forth by Canon, is a Canon of itself, and is as binding, and therefore must be obeyed. Here then we have the duty of a Clergyman in a Parish Church, and of Parish Churches we are speaking. He is bound to read the Services, as set forth in the Prayer Book by Law; a Law which he cannot annul, evade or set aside; nor could the whole body of his Clerical brethren do it. It can only be set aside by the assent of the entire co-ordinate body of the legislators, who framed it.

But, from every duty to be performed, arises a corresponding right to have it performed. It is the duty of the State to protect the citizen; from this duty arises the right to be protected. It is the duty of a City to keep its streets and highways in

order ; so that the citizen may travel freely upon them without danger to life and limb. From this duty arises his right to travel over them and have them kept in proper order. From this duty arises his right to prosecute the City and recover, if he should suffer from this cause, either in person or property. It is the duty of the Clergyman to baptize ; from this arises the right to be baptized. It is the duty of the parent to feed and clothe his child ; from this arises the right to protection, food and clothing on the part of the child, which right the law enforces. So it is with the Clergyman. The Church has set forth, by Canon, the Prayer Book. She has also set forth directions for reading the Services contained in that book. They are minute. They tell him when to stand, and when to kneel ; where to stand, and where to kneel ; when to read, and when to pray, and when to sing. She has made these incumbent upon him. And he, by taking Orders in the Church, takes the duty upon him to follow these directions, for thereby he solemnly binds himself to obey her Canons. From this duty of the Clergyman, arises the *right* of the Layman. As the Church has made it a duty of the one to perform those Services, so it is the right of the other to have them performed. If the Church has been minute in her directions, and it is the Clergyman's duty to obey those directions, the right of the Layman results, to have the Services performed according to the directions of the Church. And he has a right to them all. The Clergyman has no liberty to keep back a part.

The moment we admit that the Clergyman has a right to omit part of the Services at his caprice, that moment we give him the power to omit all. We cannot separate the one from the other; the one flows from the other. If he can take away one Prayer, by the same right he can take away all. If he can take away all, then it is not his duty to offer up the Prayers, and of course it follows that the Layman has no right to pray in his Parish Church. It is the duty of a man to pay his just debts ; and consequently the corresponding right accrues to the creditor to have them paid. But does this duty to pay debts mean that the debtor may pay only such debts as he chooses ? Not at all. The right of the creditor is to all

his money, not part. The Court always orders the whole debt to be paid; it has no discretion. If the debt be due, and is an honest one, it must be paid. Duty to be performed must be performed in full, not by halves.

What right has the Clergyman to shirk his duty, and to give as a reason, that he would rather give more time to the Sermon, and less to the Prayers? The Layman has a right to say, "That's none of your business, Sir. Do your duty. It is my right. It is your duty to read the Prayers as enjoined by the Church; and to read all of them. You have no right to prevent me from praying to God, and from doing it in the way which the Church has provided." This is a serious matter, and should be well thought of. While it should lead the Layman firmly to demand his rights, it should at the same time induce the Clergy to give the Layman his dues, and allow the entire organism of the Church to work, in its own wisely ordered arrangement.

If we are correct in the position we have taken, what shall we say of the opinion of the House of Bishops in relation to the Services? Is it meant to be a Law to be obeyed? What right have they alone to make a Law? Is it a mere expression of opinion? How does that absolve a Clergyman from his duty, or take away the rights of a Layman? No right can be taken from him, in the Church, without his own consent canonically expressed. Does it mean something, or does it mean nothing? If it means, that the Morning Service, the Litany, and Ante-Communion Services, are distinct, Laymen, who know anything about their Church, must thank them for nothing. They have known that, ever since the Prayer Book was made. If they mean, that because they are distinct, therefore they can be used at different times on the same Morning, the Layman still has nothing to thank them for; he has long known that, and has seen it practised. If it means no more than this, and is only a virtuous attempt to enlighten our ignorance, we can bow to their superior information, and receive their fatherly communication in silence and due thankfulness.

But if the House of Bishops mean, in declaring their opinion in regard to our Services, that they have a right to change

the Order of reading them, or to give a Clergyman the liberty of omitting any, or all of them, as he pleases; this is legislation; and we take issue with them at once, and insist that it is a flagrant violation of our rights as Laymen; Laymen in a double capacity, as legislators and as worshipers. The well known feeling of attachment among the Laity to their Prayer Book, and their hostility to having it touched, or altered, has led to this attempt, among some of the Clergy, to do indirectly, what only can be done by Canon Law. The result has been confusion, dissatisfaction, discontent, and a feeling towards the Clergy, which is by no means desirable. The Laity feel, and have a right to feel, that it is an attempt to do, contrary to their consent, what cannot be done without their consent; that is, to alter the Prayer Book. We do not say that all Clergymen take this view of the case, but we assert that many of them do. And they say, if the opinion of the House of Bishops does not mean this, it means nothing.

Now, the government of the Church is a government of Law. There is not a particle of irresponsible authority lodged anywhere. And there is a feeling growing among the Laity, that their rights have been attacked, and that Clergymen claim more than belongs to them. The past history of the Church shows, that all corruption in Doctrine and in Government has sprung from arbitrary authority. Look at the history of the Church for the last eighteen hundred years. What a picture does that Church present? Disjointed! split into fragments! one part refusing communion with another! Some parts awfully corrupt, and sunk into ignorance of the darkest kind! The government of the Church, we say, is a government of Law. And now, when the Laity see a disposition on the part of the Clergy to intrude upon their rights, and attempt to take away their Prayers without their consent, they ask to what will this finally grow? Far be it from us to depreciate our Clergy. Among them are some of the noblest men that God has ever made. In this country, generally speaking, a more devoted, self-denying, hard-working class of men is not to be found. There are men, and they are increasing in number, who have given up everything, and gone into privation and

want for Christ's sake and the Church. Our hope is, and must be, mainly in the Clergy. Thank God! they are not all such as we have described some to be. To the Clergy, we owe the light we have. To them, under God, we owe our Bible; to them we owe our Prayer Book. They led the way out of the great sea of moral desolation. They brought our Church back to "the Faith once delivered to the saints;" and to them we owe it, that we have these very rights, which we now claim as our due. To them we now look for aid—for help, as to these, our rights. To them do we look to allay this fear—this growing dissatisfaction and distrust, that is creeping over the Church. With them, and by their aid, can we alone preserve our Bible and our Prayer Book, our holy Faith, and our Laymen's rights, inviolate.

We pass over the Sacraments and other parts of the Prayer Book. What has been said is equally applicable to them. We take the liberty, however, of saying a word or two about Singing. We do not find fault with Congregational Singing; but we are disposed to complain of the way in which a certain style of singing is sometimes attempted to be forced upon us by the Clergy and our Church Choirs. We think that experience has clearly shown, that psalmody, or Psalms and Hymns, as now sung in our Churches, will never bring about Congregational Singing. They are too intricate, and can never be learned by a whole congregation. Whenever we have heard an attempted Congregational Singing, with our present style of Psalmody, with one or two exceptions it has been a horrible discord, that took away all devotion, and partook more of the ridiculous than the solemn. We need something more simple, more devotional, more Church-like. To that opinion we think many Churchmen are fast inclining. A simple Chant, or tune, where all can join, young and old, and which any one can sing, will give us Congregational Singing. We have Common Prayer. To have Common Praise, it must be, like the prayer, so simple that any child can join in it. We want singing for the masses, not for a few opera-goers.

But there is another point—no less important than the Prayers—in which the Layman has rights. And that is the

Sermon. We have no doubt that we shall be suspected here of going off from our own ground. But let us state our position clearly. We maintain, that a Clergyman of the Church has no right to preach any other Gospel than that which the Church holds. He can preach no more, and he can preach no less. He enters the pulpit, not as a private man, to utter private opinions. From whence does the Clergyman derive his authority to preach the Gospel? From God.—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." This command was directed to those whom He had called, "as was Aaron." This, no Churchman will deny. The channel for conveying this authority is the Church. She directs how, and to whom, it is to be given. The authority comes originally from God, but is conveyed by the Church. But what is the Gospel, which the Minister is authorized to preach? Is it merely what he, in his own private opinion, believes to be the Gospel? Or has the Church—which has ever been both the keeper, and the witness of what the Gospel is,—given a meaning and exposition of that Gospel, and directed him how to preach it? She has not only set forth Articles of Religion to express her meaning of the Gospel, and Formularies, where, by daily use, they are made more distinct and familiar,—but she binds the Clergyman, at his Ordination, to teach nothing else. He promises, at the chancel, "always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments—and the Discipline of Christ—as the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God."

Here is the rule, and the only rule, by which the Minister is to preach the Gospel. It is, "as this Church hath received the same." His authority as a Clergyman extends no further. What the Church hath not received, he cannot teach; for he never received the authority to do so. The moment he goes beyond this, and delivers his own private opinions,—either going beyond what the Church teaches, or falling short of it, or going contrary to it,—that moment he exceeds his authority. He then ceases to be the Clergyman, and sinks to the individual. Like an Ambassador, who acts upon definite instructions, he has exceeded his powers, and no one can be bound by his

The Church has always allowed great latitude of opinion upon those points on which she has not declared herself. Every one may think for himself,—and no one can call his opinion in question. This has ever been the case. One of these open questions is the doctrine of Lay-Baptism. The Church has never declared any opinion upon it. Both sides of the question have been taken by learned and good men. Every Clergyman and Layman holds to that side, to which his reading and information may lead him. Where, then, does the Clergyman get his authority to pronounce upon it—from the pulpit? The Church never gave him any.—Indeed there is none. He is going beyond his authority. The Layman may believe him, or not, as he pleases. He may go further, and tell him that he is exceeding his powers,—that the Church never authorized him to preach such doctrine—or ever said anything about it; that he is intruding upon the rights of the Laity, and using his position as a Clergyman to force upon them his own private opinions, which they are not bound to believe. For he has no right to preach what they are not bound to believe.

Take another instance: the doctrine of the Millennium. In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., there were Forty-two Articles, afterwards reduced to Thirty Nine, in the Reign of Elizabeth. Among them was one, stating, "that the notion of the Millennium is a fable, derived from Jewish tradition, and against the sense of the Scriptures." So long as that was one of the Articles, the Clergymen had not only the liberty, but was bound to preach it. The Layman was bound to listen, and to believe it as the voice of the Church. The moment it was stricken out of the Prayer-Book, neither Clergyman nor Layman was bound by it as a matter of Faith. Either might hold it as he pleased. The authority of the Clergyman was taken away, and his right to preach it fell with the Articles.

So again with the subject of Slavery. It has existed for centuries in both the Jewish and the Christian Churches. It existed through the whole Roman Empire. It was around our Saviour during His entire lifetime. He and His Apostles lived among it, and saw it as it was. Yet they never denounced it. They never said one word against it. It existed in this country

when our American Church was formed; yet she has never mentioned it in any of her Articles or Formularies. She has left it to every man as between him and his God. The Minister has received no command, no authority, no opinion in regard to it from the Church. What right would he have, then, to preach upon it from the pulpit, where he is the mouthpiece of the Church, not of his own individual opinions? What right would he have to denounce those whom the Saviour of the Church has not denounced? It would only be an abuse of the authority of the Church, to declare his own private opinions; an abuse of the pulpit; an invasion of the Layman's rights. The moment we admit that the Clergyman has the right to preach his own private opinions as the Gospel, that moment we open the floodgates to any doctrine, to every heresy. He is either bound by the Church Articles and Formularies, or he is not. If he is, he is restricted to her teachings. If he is not bound by them, then the Articles and Prayer Book are of no use; he is as free to preach Deism and Arianism, as anything else, and the vow which he makes at his Ordination is a ridiculous nullity. The whole scheme of Salvation is surely enough to treat of, without wandering into doubtful fields.

The truth is, that in this country, and in this day, we are in no small danger of being preached to death. It is an age of "itching ears." Even in the Church, preaching is exalted to the skies, in some quarters, while the very persons who do this, attempt to take away our prayers from us. Worship is undervalued. Subjects are introduced into Church pulpits, which have no place there, while Repentance and Faith, and Evangelical Obedience are forgotten. Outside of us, political harangues have taken the place of the LAMB OF GOD, Whose Blood taketh away the sins of the world. Let us bar the doors of the Church against such an intruder. The kind of preaching which the age needs, it is not for us to describe. But the kind of preaching which we are sometimes compelled to hear, when, on Sundays, grey headed Churchmen are forced to listen to some fledgeling, who endeavors to show off his new notions, leads us to say, that it is high time that Laymen asserted their rights, and put a stop to it.

child, which the Church never authorized, and which he does not believe? The Clergyman, like every one else, has a right to think and believe as he pleases. But when he enters the Pulpit, he does not appear as the man only. He is there, as the authorized agent of the Church, to preach her teachings, not his own private notions. He is there, as the Ambassador of God, to declare His Message to man, and to declare it as the Church interprets it. Acting thus, as an Ambassador, he must abide by his instructions. Beyond them, he has no authority. If he cannot do this honestly, the Church is no place for him. His learning, his abilities, may give weight to his opinions as a man, but they give him no authority as a Minister, no power as an Ambassador, and no right which any other Minister cannot exercise. Happily, our Church has, thus far, been kept, in great measure, from this abuse of the Pulpit. But still we suffer from it, and are in danger of suffering more and more. A government, not of arbitrary power, but of law, which throws its shield around the Clergy and the Laity alike, this it is, which has given to the Church a conservatism, which presents so great a contrast to the denominations around us. Let the Clergy and the Laity know their rights in the Church, and boldly maintain them; harmony and order will prevail. Each man will know his place and keep it. Our boasted conservatism will be retained, and our Church rise to a prouder pre-eminence than she has yet reached.

I am, Mr. Editor,

Your obedient Servant,

A Layman.

Art. VII.—THE POSITION OF ROMANISM IN AMERICA.

1.—*Pastoral Letter of Nine Romish American Bishops on Italian Affairs :* dated, New York, Jan. 19, 1860.

2.—*Brownson's Quarterly Review :* New York.

"From the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities,—Good Lord deliver us!"—So once prayed the Church of England. And, in days when the ashes of Smithfield fires were not cold, and the windows of Oxford had scarcely lost the glare that lit them, when Latimer andRidley stood amid the fires that Bishops' tender mercies kindled, it was not a strange prayer to put up in distinctly sounding words. But forgiveness, yea, "till seventy times seven," must be a true Church's spirit, and so the Apostolic Church of England ceased to put up a petition which appeared against the mildness of Christian charity. With all Rome's legions banded against her, herself anathematized, her heritage given to the spoiler, her children delivered to the strongest arm that could break papal fury upon them, she exercised charity so far, and Christian hope so far, as to cease a petition which seemed too harsh, as against any Christian Bishop, even when that Bishop was seeking to drown her principles in her blood. The feeling of the petition, however, can never leave either the Church of England, or the Church of America. They, at all events, know "the Bishop of Rome," and his enormities, and how needed such a prayer may sometimes be, while the system he represents continues. The very charter of their place is, "no peace with Rome."

However it may be with the bodies about us, in this country, the position of the Church of America, in this relation, admits no doubt. She is the sworn foe to Popery. She stands in the vanguard of the fight, where Gospel Truth meets the corrupt mass of middle-age abominations. Other bodies may quarrel about the needless differences of their metaphysical

"creeds;" may squabble about the "deaconing" of Sternhold and Hopkins,or the use of an organ to accompany their strains, or the amount of water necessary to baptize, or any other important straws of the time they happen to be splitting, and founding sects to keep well split; but the Church must let these elegant pastimes alone, and must stand, with her forces collected, trained, recruited, and recruiting, face to face, with her own especial, hereditary foe, preparing to dispute every inch of ground, and every new or old assumption to the bitter end; knowing and feeling, that, however the contest may appear in the varying phases of the present, it must finally narrow down to a hand-to-hand battle between ROMANISM and the CHURCH CATHOLIC, for the heritage of this fair land. This is the Church's special business, in her peculiar place and time.

The grounds of assault on Rome, taken by the Protestant sects, we know, and Rome knows, are untenable. Their champions go down at every charge. Not because the cause is weak, but because they deliberately reject the arms to defend the cause,—the whole Past of Christendom, and its witness to the One Faith. They take a ground which slips from beneath them always in the struggle. Besides, in rejecting that historic Christianity, they announce the living principle of Romanism and virtually take its side. Their "novelties," and Rome's "novelties," are different; the principle that begets them is the same. The old duty, of standing as "the bulwark of the Reformation," and asserting continually the grounds and causes and meaning of the Reformation, rests on us still, as members of the Church; and in the name "PROTESTANT," wisely, let shallow people talk as they will, *wisely* made an essential part of our name by the honored Fathers of the Church, we have a continual witness to our piety. Church principles and Romish principles are destructive of each other. These cannot meet at any point without clashing. One or the other must go down. There can be no truce and no compromise. *Two sects* may agree to share divided empire, but the position of THE TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH, and a *pretended Catholic Church* can be only a position of ceaseless antagonism. The true prince may be reconciled to a rebellious noble, or two re-

bellious nobles may agree to share their usurpations in peace, but the true prince can never compromise with the impostor, who takes his name and titles, and claims his birthright.

"But why is it necessary," we are asked, "to re-state so harshly this position of difference? Why encourage such a feeling of antagonism against Rome? 'The circles of the suns' have had their influence on the earth. All things have changed. The causes of old quarrels are dead. The ripening years have made men wiser and milder than their fathers. Rome of to-day is not Rome of the past. The spirit of stern resistance needed when all the accumulated ignorance of centuries was to be met, is not needed under the enlightenment of the present. The strong Bishop of Rome, recognized as Father and Head, and earthly symbol of Heavenly Sovereignty, by all the West three centuries ago, is weak enough now. It was needed then to arm against his usurped power, when his power was real; but poor PIUS NINTH! repudiated and spurned by nearly all Italy, propped yonder by French bayonets, guarded from the warm affections of his dear sons by a little band of hired cut-throats, poor shadow of a vanished reality! he needs pity rather than resistance. The poor man is too blind to see, what all the world sees clearly, that he is not needed, and very much in all honest men's way, in Europe, about these days. The terror is all gone, the wolf's teeth are drawn, and he should receive pity rather than opposition."

There is a good deal of such talk, and more of the feeling which such talk betrays. It has been the talk and feeling very common among the large mass of people, both in England and America, for some time past. Especially has the feeling and its expression, in one form or another, been common in America. For here we have no historic reminders, as they have in other countries, of what Romanism is, when its teeth are good and well-developed, and Romanism has availed itself of the feeling. It can march towards its end, when marching will pay, and with a grand flourish of trumpets too; but it can also sneak towards its end when necessary. It can thunder its anathemas, and loves the exercise dearly; but it can also whine for toleration, and "in bondsman's key, with bated breath,"

beg for pity at the hands of those it would turn and rend if it dare. It has, therefore, rather encouraged the feeling, that it was a poor, harmless superstition, effete, except among the ignorant, for whom it was better just than nothing, since its priests could keep them in order, when nothing else availed. The feeling has chimed in, too, with the common Protestant cant of liberality, and spread itself under that guise. The Romish Church in America has been quietly, meanwhile, reaping the benefit of creeping to its end. If, occasionally, it has been very suddenly stopped, and the roused Protestant feeling of the country has shook itself, and showed, for a moment, its latent power, it has only the silly boasting of its own leaders and champions to thank, who could not restrain the impulse to bluster and tyrannize before the time. The creeping policy was the best, but "His Grace," who really has brains beyond his Master in Italy, has also the Celtic disposition to brag.

The creeping policy has succeeded with the mass of Protestants; there is no doubt of it. They have believed the assertions made, "that Romanism of course was modified in modern times." They have dreamed "it could not live beside our Common School System;" that "with a free press and an open Bible, it must, under our free institutions, come to nothing." As if Romanism could not control our "Common School System," when it had the numbers; as if it too could not *use* a "free press;" as if our "popular institutions" were not just the institutions, in which a Church, trained for eight centuries in political intrigue, and diplomatic corruption, and secret wire-pulling, were not just the institutions in which Jesuits could show their powers! THE END, too, has been denied—pertinaciously denied. A Romish M. C. has got up in his place in Congress, and authoritatively denied, what every tyro in History knows like his alphabet, that Romish "supremacy" means *entire and unlimited supremacy over all powers, and all magistracies;* a supremacy claimed, exercised, reiterated, admitted sometimes, sometimes denied, but never, since Hildebrand, withdrawn. And he, like other Romish champions, in the very teeth of all the Past, all the Bulls and all the Doctors, and

even "*Brownson's Quarterly*," sternly demanding "both swords," (Romanism loves swords,) gets a great many innocent Protestants to believe him! "Pooh! If that is all this terrible 'supremacy' means, that we all ought to acknowledge some person over in Italy as the 'visible centre of Unity,' and you are come, trying to persuade us to do it,—if it is all so nice, and pleasant, and amiable, and unmeaning as this, and these Bulls and Inquisitions, and Anathemas and Dethronements, and Civil Wars and Massacres, are mere dreams of us ignorant Protestants, why, it does not signify. We have no objection. We love quiet and good-nature above all things. We are very much pleased, and glad to see you."

There is One Body in the country that has measured arms with Popery, and only one. *She* has historic knowledge, in her own person, of just what its pretensions are. She is the living witness to the reality of Papal claims. In the hands of her children are the prayers and confessions of her sons, her saints and martyrs, who resisted those claims, and paid the price of their resistance. She will not forget those men or the price they paid. We, who are one with them in "The Communion of Saints," who occupy their places and inherit their works, know THE END. The denials of Jesuits, sworn to deny anything or assert anything, "for the greater glory of God," cannot impose upon us. We know that the end is the establishment of a despotism, utterly irresponsible to God or man, over all men's lives and fortunes in this land. We know that is just what Papal Supremacy means; that, and nothing short of that. We know that the steady aim of every effort, and the hope to encourage every endeavor is, that Romanism may be nationalized, and the dictum of some old man, in a city four thousand miles away, whose own citizens would drive him out, but for the hired butchers that guard him, may be received, as final *law* and final *gospel*, on all questions affecting time or eternity. This is the end. Protestants sometimes affect to disbelieve it; in the face of all the past, affect to think it an impossibility. Romanists encourage them to disbelieve it, and think it impossible. Jesuits deny it flatly, and put on a very injured air when it is asserted. But, "the Church" is in-

fallible! She never has erred, never can err! She is bound to her record. The blackest registry written against her in the world's history, by her assertion of infallibility, is hers till the end. The wildest assumption of Hildebrand or Innocent, in her day of power, defines her position while she stands. There are honest men in her, too, among ourselves, who will not consent to be drilled into lying concealment. They ever and anon speak out, lest American Protestants should forget, and declare,—

"We believe the direct *temporal authority* of the Pope, as the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. The Church, by divine right, [in person of the Pope,] bears both swords, (temporal and spiritual.) The temporal sovereign holds the temporal sword subject to her order, to be exercised under her direction."—(*Brownson's Quarterly.*) And again Brownson says: "The Pope, then, even by virtue of his spiritual authority, has the power to judge all temporal questions, if not precisely as temporal, yet as spiritual,—for all temporal questions are to be decided by their relation to the spiritual,—and therefore has the right to pronounce sentence of deposition against any sovereign, when required by the good of the spiritual order."—*Ib. Jan.*, 1853, p. 48. And again: "Then the power she exercised over sovereigns in the Middle Ages was not a usurpation, was not derived from the concession of princes or the consent of the people, but was and is hers by divine right; and whoso resists it rebels against the King of kings and Lord of lords. This is the ground on which we defend the power exercised over sovereigns by Popes and Councils in the Middle Ages."—*Ib.*, p. 49. And again: "Whenever the occasion occurred, she asserted her power, not in empty words only, but in deeds, to judge sovereigns, kings, and Cæsars, to bestow or to take away crowns, to depose ungodly rulers, and to absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance."—*Ib., Jan.*, 1853, p. 54. And again: "What the Church has done, what she has expressly or tacitly approved in the past, that is exactly what she will do, expressly or tacitly approve in the future, if the same circumstances occur. This may be a difficulty, an embarrassment, but it will not do to shrink from it."—*Ib. Jan.*, 1854, p. 101.

It is not, then, merely a false system we are called to contend with. It is not merely a false Church, or a false gospel, or a heresy, or a schism. All these are there, and it is well to look to these. It is well to oppose "Romish errors," and "heresies," and "novelties," and show how "Rome is schismatic, both in Britain and in this country." But it is not well to fancy that is all. We are never to forget that these "novelties" and "errors" are only parts of a perfectly organized and officered *system*, which, by any means and all means, seeks to establish itself in power, that it may crush out all opposition and trample down all resistance. There may be, undoubtedly there are, thousands in the Romish Church, who would shud-

der at any such idea. They are, however, helping the idea to make itself real. They are in the system, working with it towards its end. We are talking about the system, not about private sentiment. They may deplore such massacres as that of Perugia, they may deplore the stealing of children from their parents, as greatly as we, and declare they "do not believe in such things." But still such things are, and they are parts of the *System*, that produces such things. It is not with mere speculative errors we have to deal, whether those errors be small or great. It is with a system, whose errors are all *practical*, whose assumption of *absolute and irresponsible divine right* over all men's souls and bodies, and whose determined, organized effort, to put itself in a position to assert and exercise that right, declares war with all its opposers, and no quarter.

For that position Romanism is striving in America. Dying at the heart, it is putting forth an abnormal power at the extremities. Recognized as an intolerable tyranny at head quarters, tyranny, which all true men, Protestant or Romish in other respects, in Europe, seem about to humble in the dust, if not destroy; a tyranny, which those who suffer it, and those who know it, cry out against, in these days, with supplicating voices; its supporters here, using the freedom which a Protestant land of English speech alone would allow them, and no Romish Government on earth permits, are seeking to defend it, and spread its influence here, to make up for its weakness at home. THE ARCHBISHOP OF FLORENCE gladly chants *Te Deum* over his country's rescue, and welcomes her anathematized deliverer. Italian Bishops and Priests offer thanksgivings for deliverance from their "Spiritual Father's" hands. THE ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK, and his American subordinates, sign a Memorial, warning all the world against lightening the intolerable yoke on a gallant people's neck, on pain of their high displeasure! And Irish Bishops, defended by a free and Protestant Government, threaten Europe with Tipperary, unless the Pope is allowed to trample on human rights to his heart's content.

In proportion as the system fails in lands where it has run its course, will it make redoubled efforts here. How fast it has spread, how deeply it is rooting itself in this country, perhaps few Protestants consider. There are cities all over the West where it is the dominant influence; growing towns, where its Cathedral spires are the highest landmarks to the traveler's approach, where its whole machinery of Schools, Nunneries, and Confraternities are hard at work to mould the public sentiment. It secures endowments, lands, legacies of building sites, with a wise forethought, and beyond anything at all known among others. We could give statistics to show this, which would startle those who have not examined the subject. In St. Louis, for instance, its *productive* property is reckoned by millions. It has in its hands, in several cities, to our knowledge, property of value enough to buy up half a dozen Legislatures and Supreme Courts, if necessary, as those Institutions now go in some Western States. The terrors of Purgatory are found now as available a screw as ever to squeeze the dying for the aggrandizement of the Priesthood. And all the "Church" acquires, let it be remembered, is in the "Church's" hands. Rome allows no lay interference in the disposal of her wealth.

But, notwithstanding all it can do, all it has done and is doing, it is held as quite impossible that such a system can obtain anything like a commanding influence in a country like our own. Let us see whether this is so impossible as many fancy. Let us see what its advantages and disadvantages are in this country, and whether there is not need of watchfulness.

There are over two millions, out of the twenty-eight or thirty millions in this country, who are under the *direct* influence of the Romish priesthood. Their *indirect* influence extends to more than twice the number. Now, they have this advantage, first, that this body is organized and acts according to the word of command. It is a great advantage. The Priests command them, and there is no disobedience; occasional restlessness and mutiny, indeed, but, in the end, all follow their divinely appointed leaders. "But these people are nearly all foreigners—the Church itself is foreign." Now these people are *not* foreigners. They are

Americans, for all necessary purposes, as much as yourself, good Reader. *They can vote*, and "vote early and vote often," as the newspapers say. And *they vote as they are bid ;* that is another great advantage. True to her instincts, the Church of Rome manipulates the politics of the land, and sells and trucks and barters, her Bishops with the great leaders, her Priests with the dirty pot-house leaders, of any political party, that will pledge her the object she has in hand. She has stood now for years in the position of a political party, holding, in many places, the balance of power, and ready to sell so may votes for so much reward. The very ignorance of the mass of her laity, their very drunkenness and vice, and degradation, have been advantages to her in this matter. They have been more entirely, on those accounts, under priestly drill, and more efficient in the rowdyism that so often disgraces the polls, and keeps decent men away. Political leaders, who would sell their very souls for Office, or its rewards, are secretly closeted with Romish Priests and Bishops before Elections, promising Romanists the lower Offices, pledging "the Church" their influence in this matter, or in that. In many of our cities, therefore, it comes to pass, that the Offices, which, after all, affect us most, the Offices that administer the smaller causes and guard the public peace, are in the hands of men utterly ignorant and unfit, and above all, entirely commanded and guided by "the Priest." We know a city, where, in the very teeth of the Constitution, the Common Council passed an ordinance, giving public money for the support of a Jesuit School! A majority had pledged themselves before election, to the Priest, for his support. The firmness of the Mayor alone prevented the consummation. It was shown, sometime since, that in New York, manipulated in the same way, a Common Council were actually going to make Bishop Hughes a present of public property, to the amount of *half a million!* And it is well understood, that when a Church is to be built, or a Nunnery established, or a School founded, votes, at the next election, are to be bought by *Protestant* aspirants with liberal contributions. It is easy to talk about Romanism being a *foreign* influence. Of course it is, it is meant to be so. The aim is to keep it so, to make

a foreigner, to whom the final allegiance is due, as GOD'S Vicegerent, supreme here. It is easy to talk of *ignorance*, and consequent lack of influence, but the fact is, the Jesuits and the Priests are using such material, as they could use no other, and gaining advance and power from those very causes. The very vice and crime among Romanists is, in this way, made to tell for the cause. In Chicago, a "House of Refuge," a temporary prison, was instituted for juvenile offenders. Of course, the vast majority of its inmates were Romanists. Immediately, the Clergy, headed by the Bishop, petitioned the City Government to appoint one of their number Chaplain, on the express ground that ten to one of these young thieves and reprobates were children of "the Church!" Some people might very naturally think, that if the influence of "the Church," and its pastoral care, landed them so abundantly, at their years, in a jail, it were perhaps as wise not to continue that influence longer, and so opposed the appointment of a salaried Jesuit as Chaplain.

Thus our "free institutions," which so many fancy are an effectual barrier against Popery, are simply the best institutions possible for its advance, considering the organization of the Church, and the character of its Clergy and laity; and considering, too, the demagogism and utter lack of principle that reign too often in political councils.

The fact, too, that the country is *Protestant*, is another advantage, strange as it may seem. In Romish countries, the Church is still *National*. The limits of power are defined. Concordats interpose between the Church and the Pope. The will of the Vatican is controlled by the will of the Palace. The Church's teaching is checked and modified. Bulls cannot be published without imperial permission. Dangerous and extravagant Pastorals, like that of Bishop Hughes, and his suffragans, are not allowed to see the light. Ultra-Montane papers are "warned" or "suppressed." Jesuits are banished for interfering in political intrigues. Colleges and Schools are under superintendence from constituted authority. Nunneries and Monasteries are visited and controlled under established law, and the power of "the Church" and "the Vicar" thus restrain-

ed from the people under due bounds. This is the case, more or less, in all Romish countries. In England, and especially in America, no barriers are interposed. The Pope is supreme only in a *Protestant* country. There are no treaties defining his power, no Concordats telling him, thus far and no farther. Jesuits have free course. The most extravagant Ultra-Montanism is taught and practiced. The institutions of the Church are not controlled for the quiet of the State, and the only allegiance recognized is allegiance to the Pope; and the only authority acknowledged is the authority of "the Vicar of Christ." The mass of the people do not understand this—that the Romish Church is free *only in a Protestant country*, and the Pope's power irresponsible only in a land *where all other power is held to be a mere Godless usurpation*, because it does not exist with his sanction. They will soon understand it, if they reflect. This is why Pastorals are issued, and sermons preached, and papers printed, in America and England, fearlessly and confidently, which not a man of them dare print, or issue, or preach in any Romish country in the world, save under the shadow of the Vatican, and the protection of Lamoriciere's guards. The London "*Tablet*" warns its brethren to speak out, since they alone can speak, guarded by Protestant law and freedom, what the brethren in the countries of the Faith dare not utter!—A pregnant confession!

Another great advantage, which the Romish Church has in this country, is, that its Clergy are mostly educated without cost to it. *We* have to found Schools and Scholarships; we have to beg and plead for means to educate the Candidates for the Ministry, and establish here and there a School to train men for our growing wants. A young branch of the Church, not rich and not numerous, we have had to do it from the first. England has sent her Church members here in thousands, but has sent no Clergy to look after them; has founded no school, and scarcely aided one here to train Clergy to keep them in the Faith. But an English Parliament sustains *Maynooth*, a Jesuit-training College! And one large business, in which Maynooth spends the generous grants of an English House of Commons, is, *in educating Jesuit Priests for the United States!*

We have often wondered whether English Churchmen knew anything about this. It seems impossible they could be blind to a thing going on so effectively and openly. Romish Priests, educated with English money, are scattered all over the country. Maynooth sends her supplies regularly. It may be as well for England to be rid of them, but it certainly is quite too much generosity to send them here. This regular and steady supply, educated so generously by the Government of a Protestant nation, with Protestant money, for the conversion of benighted heretics across the seas, has been over and above what Romanism has needed to do here on the ground, and an incalculable source of power. An Irish Romish Colony comes, and Maynooth at once has the Priest ready. An English Colony of Churchmen comes, and half of them do not know there is a Church in America! And the other half expect to find the Vicar and the Beadle, and an endowed Church, wherever they may drop, loyally praying for the Queen still! And the Church of England cannot afford a man to save her emigrating children from "all false doctrine, heresy and schism!" We do not wish to speak harshly, but we have often felt sick at heart in this regard, and we wish to speak *plainly* to our English brethren, and call their *active* attention to a sore evil.

It is not from Maynooth alone, that Romanism has received men ready formed for her work, although they are usually her most zealous and efficient servants. The Romish Churches of the Continent have also supplied Clergy, as well as laity, though not in such numbers, or of such unscrupulous devotion.

But the grand advantage of Romanism in this country is, that it meets no resistance. A Protestantism torn to tatters, with no historic hold on the National conscience, with little deep learning, with no sure basis of Faith, split up and wrangling on opinions, with no liturgic formulas to hold it to the Truth, with a bald, bare worship, with no organized efficiencies in charity or in education, without the pretence of any Divine sanction, or any Apostolic descent to have influence on human conscience in its teachings,—such a Protestantism has seen Popery plant itself, and spread itself, and, except some wild, blind, ignorant efforts, springing from startled prejudice, and

consequently fruitless, has offered no resistance. It has stood, looking on in stupid wonder at the spread of Romanism, confessing itself, in its suicidal divisions, utterly unfit to deal with this great question of the time. Popery has entered its schools, its houses, its families, the families even of its Preachers and Doctors, has controlled them, has asserted itself, and made its power felt at the very hearth, at the family altar. There are stories of strong Protestant D. D.'s, with basket in hand, searching the market for fish, "because Biddy could not eat meat in Lent," or, "because to-morrow was Friday," and stories of congregations waiting for the Preacher, who was kept late, because the same important personage was away at "Early Mass." And the "Protestant Minister" has found his family arrangements, and his "Church appointments," controlled, whether or no, according to the will of *Father Blank*. We have been often amused at it, and the helpless complaints uttered against ignorance and superstition. And yet there, in the man's own household, he could not deal with that ignorance and superstition, and folded his Protestant hands helplessly, while "the Priest" ruled his table and his hours, and perhaps *quietly baptized his children*. He and his brethren could hold big meetings to welcome "Irish deputations," could give them good words and good bank notes to help convert the Romanists in Ireland. But the Irish in their own houses, the Romanists who are flocking out of Ireland into their own streets and cities, they let well alone. They have neither "society" or "mission" for those who come to their own doors for conversion. "Far birds have fine feathers." Though we find no fault with what is done, but with what is left undone.

It has, we say, had no resistance worthy of the name. There is no organized religious influence that it fears, to meet it, among the mass of contending Protestantism. There is no *ground* on which to meet it among the sects. They ordinarily never approach the subject at all, except to have the falseness of their own position shown, and to find themselves routed by an array of pretended antiquity that they do not know to be pretended. The boast of a "free press," too, which dispenses

light, and was to clear away all old world superstitions, is also found to be a mere boast. There is no resistance there. A venal press dare only "peep and mutter," often at the bidding of Romanism. *These men have votes*, and a political press, in its entire servility and meanness, with some noble exceptions, is often the engine of Jesuitism.

These are encouragements enough, and the result is, that Romanism has become bolder and more reckless of concealment. As it has gained ground, and obtained power, and increased in numbers, it has cast off the mask of prudence. Its emissaries were never bolder, never busier, than they are at this moment. They have marshalled their forces. They have had "Monster Meetings." They have had Speeches and Resolutions. Their ablest men are traveling and lecturing to the Faithful. Lectures on "the Pope's temporal power," on the "Infallibility," on "the cause of the Pope the cause of popular Freedom," on "the service the Popedom has rendered Arts and Letters," have been and are now delivered throughout the East and West, to mould public sentiment, in the present state of Europe. In one city of the Mississippi, an "Eloquent Jesuit Father," to quote the newspapers, has been lecturing for scores of Sunday nights, "to large audiences of Protestants," on the beauties of Romanism, and the advantages resulting from union with "the Fatherly heart of the Father of Christendom," and has been "receiving many converts." Down in Boston, the Protestant Ministers shut up their Meeting Houses lately, so that their nice young people could listen to Father ——'s honied words. What the character of these Lectures is, they need not be told, who know the unblushing misrepresentations and brazen contradictions, the downright falsehoods and the garbled quotations of Jesuit polemics, and yet the polished eloquence too, stopping at nothing for the cause, and tripping at no falsehood that can possibly be imposed on ignorance. Neither need they be told, who know the utter ignorance of the Christian Past, among ordinary Protestants, how prepared they are to be bewildered and confounded by the specious lies of a glib-tongued "eloquent Jesuit."

"But, after all, Romanism is not making converts." No, it is

not. It makes loud boasts, it blows all its trumpets, it understands that business thoroughly, when some poor moth hath scorched his foolish wings and *fallen ;* but the dust and noise clears away and there is only a scorched moth and the bad odor of extinct candles. A good sized room will hold all the converts Romanism has made in the country. Notwithstanding all the advantages, and all the progress we have indicated, for ourselves, we have not the least idea that this year, or next year, or many years to come, will add any converts of consequence to Popery, or that one will be gained for a dozen lost of its own numbers. Romanists do not have that idea either, at least after they come to years of discretion. The aim of the present is to keep their own people, to hold them as a distinct, separate influence, to keep up, as much as possible, their peculiar nationalities, to encourage their imported prejudices, to educate their children in the same views, to acquire property, always a *power* in a commercial country, and gradually to accustom Protestants to their claims, and gradually to get those claims acknowledged. But, even stating their present hopes at the lowest, is it enough to console us, to reflect that an utterly corrupt and corrupting system, striking at the very root of Christian Truth, confounding the very sense of right and wrong, outraging the Conscience, and professedly, as far as the Jesuits are concerned, calling in lies to serve the truth and Beelzebub to help the Lord, is it enough to console us, that such a system is not making converts? With a strong, united, firm-fronted Apostolic Church to meet it, such a system would see men fleeing from its corruptions in a panic! Nay, we are not going to wake up some fine morning and find America Romish! There is Mexico just below. Most Americans understand perfectly, what Popery has done for Mexico. There are our own jails and penitentiaries and lock-ups, and our own criminal lists, sad enough in these days, and the predominance of "Good Catholics" there is very evident. Romanism has shown its power to stultify the common conscience by the Confessional and priestly "direction," and the people have seen it. They have compared Austria and Saxony ; Italy and Sweden ; England and Spain ; France, which has always resist-

ed Papal claims, with Naples that until now has admitted them. They have used their eyes. Over all the world they have seen the same system work the same results of misery, slavery and degradation, and these just in proportion to its perfect reception. They have seen these invariable concomitants of Popery better developed as they neared the system's centre, until they have culminated, to the disgrace and shame of Christendom, under the shadow of the Papal palace. And now, at last, they have seen the "Pope's children," almost at his own doors, rise *en masse* to vote the Papal Government an intolerable tyranny, while his supple tools, the Jesuits, have been banished the country. They have found that, let a man travel where he will, he cannot pass from the frontiers of a Romish country into those of a Protestant, without knowing it by lessening beggary, misery and ignorance. It were a mad thing to dream that, in a land like this, many could be found to submit will and conscience to a system under whose bitterness the world groans, whose results they are so often wretchedly reminded of at their own doors.

What we wish to say here is, that it is not enough that the system makes no converts. *It ought to lose converts steadily.* We should have an organized power to deal with the system. We should recognize our bounden duty in the matter. The Church, at all events, can deal with it. She should have a conscious effort in that direction. It is ours to point the duty, not ours to plan the method of its execution. But a "mission to Romanists," an effort wisely directed, with tongue and pen, to re-state clearly and boldly the errors of Romanism in modern speech, and the changeless truth of God, which it has so grievously perverted, on the grounds of Scripture and the historic Church; for our own country's needs, such an effort is a plain duty. We can make the effort. From our grounds, we can make it hopefully. It is our special work. We should at all events prepare for it, learn to look at it, and acknowledge it. Romanism can be met on Church principles alone. We owe the duty to the country, we owe it to the misled and ignorant masses at our doors, who are as really slaves to a degrading idolatry, (that *we* know,) as those to whom we send

missionaries. It would be no discouragement that the fruit of our labor should be in our own country, under our own eyes. If there is hope for these masses, it is solely in the Church. Without that, they have the alternative of infidelity. And Romanists are recruiting the ranks of the "back-alley Atheists," at a fearful rate. As things go, they have only that brotherhood to fall back upon, when common sense and partial education lead them to rebel against the outrages of "the Church." This army of recruits to the ranks of unbelief, from the children of Romish training, is daily on the increase. It will go on increasing. The American Church is called to speak out for their sakes. She should take her place, assert her claims, plainly state her endless antagonism to Popery, and its grounds, and with no fear, and no favor, and certainly with no ludicrous cant about "a sister Church," much less with any hankering pity or regard for Middle Age abominations, should assert in her own born Saxon, the honest blunt tongue of free men all over the world, her stern uncompromising *Protestantism.* In the same speech, she should assert and boldly vindicate her Catholicity; boldly challenge the tests to try her as the representative here, in Faith and Orders, of the Ancient Apostolic and Catholic Church of GOD.

Having stated what we consider a so far greatly neglected duty of our own in this matter, let us turn again to the position of Romanism in the country at large. We have seen that it has had advantages growing out of the nature of the country and its institutions, and that those advantages have been faithfully used. The statistics of emigration indeed show that it has lost greatly, but still its success in retaining its own, upon our shores, has been, all things considered, surprising indeed. Two-thirds, at least, who arrive Romanists, come at once under priestly direction. To balance these advantages, there has always been the latent conviction in the mind of the country, that Romanism was not so much a *religion* as a *political system.* The very means employed for its advancement have brought this conviction home to all who looked. It was a true conviction. All intelligent Protestants knew that. To the surprise of its leaders, that conviction was at last uttered

in a very emphatic way, and a sudden storm of feeling roused against foreign despotism in America, and some very startling and ugly questions asked, as to what Government Romish Bishops and Priests, at least, owed allegiance.

Of course, in true Jesuit style, there were indignant denials of every charge. They saw that this conviction in the minds of the American people was the barrier to stop their aim. To those who knew Romanism intelligently, that knowledge was of course beyond all denial, that the position of the Romish Church in America is, simply, that of a foreign power claiming sovereignty here by divine right. But the mass of the people did not know it intelligently, and only by the repeated and pertinacious action of the Church itself was the clear knowledge forced upon them. Then came the denials, the injured innocence, the complaints of prejudice, the soft explanations, the mild expostulations, the whole system of mental reservation and double-meaning and prevarication, which you, Reader, and we, understand so well, but which the mass of people do not understand at all.

That feeling, that the Church of Rome in this country is not a Church, and not a Faith, and not a religion merely, or mainly, but that it is rather an organized political institution, seeking supremacy here, as it has everywhere, supremacy spiritual and temporal, and that it uses its Church authority, and its religious influence, and the religious instincts and faith of its people, steadily for that end,—this feeling, beyond all argument and assailment, has been mainly the protection of the country as a Protestant one. The mass of the people might be easily deluded by the specious lies of controversialists; they might be easily seduced by the logic, which proves the truth of the *Real Presence*, and then changes the word for the lie of *Transubstantiation;* they might be imposed upon by the argument that vindicates *Church Authority*, and then claims to have proved *Infallibility;* by the reasoning that sets forth the doctrine of the *Intermediate State*, and then juggles in *Purgatory;* by the high sounding learning that quotes forged Decretals, and garbled Epistles and apochryphal treatises, and calls that the "Testimony of the Fathers." They might be

easily misled by the well known tricks of trained Jesuit champions, with "dispensations" to assert anything or deny anything, for the "good of the Church." They cannot search out these subtleties, they cannot expose these mis-statements. Even their teachers ordinarily lack acquaintance with the system, and sufficient learning. In argument, as we have said, the Jesuits have had it all their own way with them. But with the people as a whole, argument has had its effect, simply because no argument could convince them, in spite of their eyes, that Romish Bishops and Priests and Jesuit missionaries, were not laboring for this one end, the introduction of an organized foreign despotism.

Here is, after all, the great weakness of Romanism in America. It is in the land, but not of it. It is felt to be so. It is Italian, and not American. Its priesthood is largely Jesuitical and Ultra-Montane, and at war with Free Institutions. Its organization and its ideas, are antagonistic to the national life and feeling. It cannot naturalize itself, without ceasing to be Romish. The very causes of its growth, its immense foreign immigration,—its foreign priests,—with no ties binding them to the country,—its Bishops, appointed by a Foreign Prince,—its exclusive schools,—its organized, separate political standing in the country's national or local politics,—all these have been, while giving it growth and power and wealth, only arraying against it more sternly and consciously the quiet, unspoken conviction of all Americans.

The capacities of the system for delusion have therefore had abundant exercise in trying to remove this national conviction. No opportunity has been neglected, no effort has been spared, no falsehood about its own established principles boggled to persuade people, against their very eyes, that Romanism was a most harmless affair, a thing purely religious, purely conscientious, having nothing to do with the kingdoms of this world, having no ambition of any power save spiritual, the fast friend of free institutions, and a bulwark, if once well introduced, for the everlasting defence of our own. You, Reader, like ourselves, have read somewhat of the doings in the ages, something of the way the world's story has run for several centuries

back, and we know the herculean labor the champions of Rome undertook. We can guess at the depth of ignorance they presuppose in an American audience, when they undertake to convince it of the great love Romanism bears to freedom and enlightenment!

Nevertheless, they did presuppose such ignorance, and did undertake such labor. How it has fared with them, the "eloquent Jesuit Fathers," who have been drummed out of nearly every "Catholic" country in Europe, as the most unscrupulous slaves of a wretched tyranny, probably know as well as we. They could, however, feign to worship *freedom* in America, as they have feigned to worship *Buddh* in China, and cry "liberty" here as they cry absolutism in Spain.

But the foundations are at last breaking up. The voice of brave people, gnawing their tongues for pain, their cries to a civilized Christendom for relief under the laziest, vilest, and most grinding of tyrannies, have entered into all men's ears. Men have almost held their breath, over the spectacle of people butchered at their own doors, women and children slaughtered in their own streets, by renegade miscreants, at the word of a master they have sold themselves to for so many *scudi* a day; over a vile system whose cruelty and stupidity are only equaled by its weakness. Sympathy and indignation both have found expression over all the world. And men breathe freer, now that that bloody game has been played out, and played so nobly too. Should Americans, of all men, be dumb? They were there to see, when the "Father of Christendom" blessed his children in Perugia. They have seen the "butcher of Bologna" hissed and stormed out of their own shores by his indignant countrymen. They have traveled over the fairest land beneath the sun, and they have seen what "the Church" has made of Italy, and how happy, and contented, and altogether Arcadian a life *they* used to lead, under the benign government of the "Holy Father," who inhabits that favored land! And they have seen that whole system at last crumbling to ruin, the Pope's temporal sovereignty spurned, and his Bulls of excommunication laughed and jeered at!

A little while ago, and when the issue was as yet pending,

they asked the champions of the Romish system in this country, the common-sense question: "Since this system, as you claim, is only spiritual, and this authority only heavenly and not earthly, and this supremacy you want to introduce among us only a supremacy in the Faith, why not free these groaning thousands, or let them free themselves, and still let your 'successor of St. Peter,' be supreme in his spiritual sovereignty?" And how was that question answered? Let it never be forgotten, that the answer was given in monster "meetings of sympathy with the Pope," in Sermons, in Lectures, in Articles in their periodicals, in large sums of money sent to sustain him, and at last in a "Pastoral Letter" by the Bishops. The answer was, "We did not mean to confess it, but we were cheating you all along. We uphold this despotism. It is "*the apple of our eye.*" Our system is a political system. We will not allow it to be called in question. It *exists* by the chicanery of European politics; we will *prop* it with the chicanery of American politics, too. Let Italy groan as it may, 'the Church' shall still exercise the '*divine right*' of trampling on the necks of *four millions* at least, till she is ready, as we hope, at last to trample on the necks of *two hundred millions*. So many must be left to keep her in exercise." That was virtually the answer, as understood by the American people. To have that answer laid away in their memory, is the price Bishop Hughes and his party have paid for their aid and comfort in trying, and trying in vain, to support, from free America, a foreign usurper and tyrant on his seat. They may as well lay that assurance away in their hearts. This lesson will not be forgotten. To convince us to our own eyes, that their "Church" is not Catholic, to show us, past debate, its position spiritually, the Pope, the other day, "out of his own head," made a bit of a Faith for them, and set them all to preaching a gospel, now five years old! To convince us of its position temporally, which they have so pertinaciously denied as a "vile, Protestant slander," when asserted by us, they now rally their forces, and collect their funds, and issue their Pastorals in support of a wretchedness and corruption, a vile imposition, and a stupid, contemptible tyranny, for whose

existence, while it lasted, the cheeks of all decent men in Christendom, *of all names*, were reddening with shame,—and which the Pope's own people have hurled from them with indignation! In "heretic" America, enjoying a free speech that they could not enjoy in "Catholic" Austria, they have so used the gift. In "heretic" England, protected by Protestants in the right "to speak the thing they will," they have done the same. Protestants have drawn conclusions. Romanists are drawing them, too. We are sincerely thankful. Romanism has dropped the mask. It stands confessed. The "infallible Church" has re-affirmed in 1860, the black and *red* story of its Past. It is a little funny, we confess, to see Brownson, the reviewer, whose words we have quoted above, just now taking the back track and eating his own words. "It is a way he has."

What the end may be in Europe we do not know; whether, what all Americans must hope for, the utter and final downfall of a worse than Turkish imbecility and absolutism, or their firmer re-establishment by fraud and force on the necks of a suffering people, we cannot tell. Popery seems buried so deep, that it can have no resurrection. Let that go as it will, we have Romanism of the Jesuit and Ultra-Montane type here with us. We are called to deal with it and its results and efforts. We should do so understandingly. We should meet it, on no half-way ground of apology or concealment, in no mere mazy debates about speculative and school Theology, as if it were merely a system of false opinions, and an erring form of a purely spiritual Faith. There has been too much of that already. In all cases, it should be met on its own ground, on its own *now* avowed position,—that, namely, of an organized system, using the pretence of Christianity and religion to establish a Foreign Prince and Bishop, as the supreme lord over men's unwilling souls and bodies, and wielding "the *two* swords" at his sovereign pleasure. The first assertion in the contest being, that "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in these United States of America."

Whatever may be the ultimate result in Europe, the present troubles of the Papacy have done this much good in America. They have brought about an authoritative statement of the po-

sition of Romanism here, which has strengthened seven-fold th conviction, which so far, in spite of all effort, has been the ad mantine barrier against it here. It has confessed among u that a besotted brutal tyranny is "the apple of its eye." I has published itself a conscious part of the old well-known sy tem that enslaved men's souls and tortured their bodies. I has re-affirmed, before all the world, under its hand and seal, th record of the Past,—its aims in America, the old aims whi outraged people rebelled against of old, driven to despair. I will not be allowed to shirk that ground hereafter. It will l held to its confessions, in this country at least. Weak, ami ble Protestants can read it now at its own lips, and sentiment young gentlemen, who have coquetted with a Mediævalism the nick-named "Catholic," are without excuse for their vagari hereafter. The lines are drawn by the hands of the Roma ists themselves. The spirit of stern resistance, dormant i Protestants, has been roused and concentrated, by the revel tions of Romanism in the last year, and thousands who are i the system have been shocked into a deeper knowledge of wh it really is. The Romish Church in America, by confessin itself so thoroughly the Romish Church of the Pope's ow heart, has, with all the Jesuit acuteness of its leaders, give itself, if *we* are wise and watchful, the death-blow to its hope At all events, American Popery has "DEFINED ITS POSITION."

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.*

JOURNAL

OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BISHOPS, CLERGY AND LAITY,

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

IN A

CONVENTION,

HELD IN

The City of Trenton, in New Jersey, from Tuesday, September 8, to Saturday, September 12, 1801.

LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

From the State of Massachusetts.—Rev. Samuel Parker, D. D., Rev. William Harris.

From the State of Connecticut.—Rev. Ashbel Baldwin, Rev. Philo Shelton, Rev. Evan Rogers, James Clark, Esquire.

From the State of New York.—Rev. Abraham Beach, D. D., Rev. Isaac Wilkins, Rev. John Ireland, Rev. John Henry Hobart, John Read, Esquire, William Ogden, Esquire.

From the State of New Jersey.—Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., Rev. Charles H. Wharton, D. D., Colonel Samuel Ogden, Matthias Williamson, jun, Esquire, John Dennis, Esquire.

From the State of Pennsylvania.—Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rev. Robert Blackwell, D. D.

From the State of Delaware.—Rev. Robert Clay, Rev. William Pryce, Joseph Burn, Esquire.

From the State of Maryland.—Rev. James Kemp, Rev. Joseph G. J. Bend, Rev. John Coleman, Rev. George Dashiell, David Kerr, Esquire, William Helmsley, Esquire.

*Continued from Vol. XIII. p. 534.

meet each day at 9 o'clock, A. M. and adjourn at 1 o'clock, P. M. and meet again at 4 o'clock, P. M.

Dr. Parker was requested by this house to give information to the House of Bishops of the foregoing resolution, who reported that they acceded to the same.

The Rev. Dr. Beach presented the testimonial required by the canons, from the state Convention of New York, in favour of the Rev. Benjamin Moore, D. D., the Bishop elect of that state.

On motion, the following message was sent by the Rev. Mr. Hobart to the House of Bishops: "The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies wish to know from the House of Bishops, whether they have received any communication from Bishop Provoost, on the subject of his resignation of his Episcopal jurisdiction in the state of New York."

A communication was received from the House of Bishops, on the subject of the foregoing message from this house.

The house then proceeded to sign the testimonial required by the canons in favour of the Rev. Benjamin Moore, D.D., Bishop elect of the state of New York; which, together with the testimonial from the state Convention of New York, was ordered to be presented to the House of Bishops.

The house then adjourned until 4 o'clock,

WEDNESDAY, 4 *o'clock, P. M.*

The house met.

The Rev. Charles H. Wharton, D. D., a Clerical Deputy from the state of New Jersey, and the Rev. Joseph G. J. Bend, a Clerical Deputy from the state of Maryland, presented their testimonials, which were approved, and they took their seats accordingly.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this house shall be read at the opening of the house every morning.

The question being called for upon the alteration of the first article of the constitution, as proposed by the last General Convention; and the votes being taken by states, it was negatived.

The house then adjourned until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

THURSDAY MORNING, *Sept.* 10.

The House met according to adjournment, and the Chaplain read prayers.

Matthias Williamson, jun. Esq., Lay Deputy from the State of New Jersey; the Rev. Robert Clay, and the Rev. William Price, Clerical Deputies, and Joseph Burn, Esq., Lay Deputy from the state of Delaware; the Rev. John Coleman, and Rev. George Dashiell, Clerical

Deputies, and William Helmsley, Esq., a Lay Deputy from the state of Maryland, presented their testimonials, which were read and approved, and they took their seats accordingly.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing this house that they had read and approved the testimonials in favour of the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Moore, Bishop elect of the state of New York, and had appointed to-morrow morning, 10 o'clock, for his consecration.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Mr. Bend inform the House of Bishops, that this House will attend the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Moore at the appointed time.

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Wharton, *Resolved*, That the following addition be made to the 4th canon of 1799; viz. "unless when such candidate come recommended by the General Convention."

The Rev. Dr. Wharton was requested to carry the foregoing resolution to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

The following resolution was moved by Mr. Kerr:

Whereas, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held at Philadelphia in June, 1799, resolved that all proceedings respecting the consecration of the Rev. Uzal Ogden, D. D., ought to be suspended until a future Convention of the state of New Jersey shall declare their sense of the subject;

Resolved, That the proceedings and declaration of the state Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New Jersey, on the subject to them referred, be read, and that the testimonials of this house, requisite on such occasions, be given by this house.

The proceedings of the state Convention of the Protestant Episcopal church in New Jersey, respecting the election of Dr. Ogden as Bishop for that state, were accordingly read, and fully considered; and the question upon signing the requisite testimonial being taken by states, it was negatived.

The house adjourned to 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, 4 *o'clock, P. M.*

The house met.

A communication from the House of Bishops, respecting the articles of religion, was read;

And, on motion, a committee, consisting of a Clerical member from each state, viz. Dr. Parker, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Wilkins, Dr. Ogden, Dr. Smith, Mr. Clay, and Mr. Kemp, were appointed to take into consideration the foregoing communication from the House of Bishops, and were ordered to report to this House to-morrow.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, disagreeing to the resolution of this house, making an addition to the fourth canon of 1799, and proposing instead thereof, that the fourth canon of 1795 be revived with the following addition; viz. "In which case the Bishop shall record the reasons of the aforesaid dispensation; and the reasons so recorded shall be liable to be called for at any meeting of the state Convention, and, if said Convention think proper, shall be entered on their journals,"—"the fourth canon of 1799 to be repealed."

This house disagreed to the proposed substitute from the House of Bishops to their resolution, and requested a conference. Dr. Parker, Rev. Mr. Wilkins, and Rev. Mr. Kemp, were appointed a committee on the part of this house; and the Rev. Mr. Hobart was requested to inform the House of Bishops thereof.

The following resolution was received from the House of Bishops, and agreed to by this house; viz.

Resolved, That it be made known to the State Conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine, in the next general Convention, on the following alteration of the first article of the constitution, viz:

Art. 1. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, on the third Tuesday of May, 1808, and on the third Tuesday of May in every third year afterwards, &c. as before.

A proposed canon was received from the House of Bishops, respecting those persons who shall discontinue, without lawful cause, all exercise of the ministerial office; which was considered by this House, and agreed to.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the following clause be added to the 6th rule of order: "without the consent of two-thirds of the House."

On motion of Mr. Kerr, *Resolved*, That the presiding Bishop in the House of Bishops, be requested to appoint a clergyman of this House, to perform divine service, and preach a sermon every evening during the present session.

On motion of the Rev. Mr. Bend, *Resolved*, That it be recommended to the several State Conventions of this church, to cause as great a number as possible of the constitution and canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and of the constitution and canons of their respective churches, to be printed and distributed among their respective congregations.

The foregoing resolution was transmitted to the House of Bishops, and a message was received from them, informing this House that they had concurred in the same.

The Rev. Mr. Rogers, from Connecticut, asked leave of absence during the remainder of the session, which was granted.

The Rev. Mr. Ireland, from the state of New York, asked leave of absence during the remainder of the session, which was granted.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *September* 11.

The house met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

The Rev. Mr. Harris, from Massachusetts, asked leave of absence during the remainder of the session, which was granted.

The House then adjourned to attend divine service at St. Michael's church, Trenton, on occasion of the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Moore, Bishop elect of the church in New York.

After divine service, the House met at 4 o'clock, P. M.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the thanks of this House be presented to the Right Rev. Bishop White, for his sermon delivered this day, at the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Moore, and that he be requested to furnish a copy of the same for publication.

A proposed canon was received from the House of Bishops, limiting the operation of the 4th canon of 1795.

The foregoing canon was adopted with an amendment.

The Rev. Dr. Parker, Rev. Mr. Shelton, and James Clark, Esq., were appointed a committee to consider certain memorials presented to this House from churches in New Hampshire and Vermont, and to report thereon.

The Committee appointed to consider the communication from the House of Bishops, respecting the articles of religion, made a report, which was unanimously adopted, and sent to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

The Rev. Mr. Wilkins presented the following proposed canon: "No Lay Deputy shall be admitted as a member of this House, who shall not have been a communicant of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for at least one year previous to his appointment.

The question was taken by states on the foregoing canon, and the yeas and nays were as follows:

CLERGY.	LAITY.
Massachusetts—No.	
Connecticut—Yea.	Connecticut—No.
New York—Yea.	New York—Yea.
New Jersey—No.	

Clergy.	Laity.
Pennsylvania—No.	
Delaware—No.	Delaware—No.
Maryland—No.	Maryland—No.

So it was determined in the negative.

Resolved, That the Secretaries of the former Convention, and the Secretaries of the present Convention, be requested to transmit all the papers to the committee who were appointed for the purpose of arranging and recording the Journals of the General Convention; and, when these papers are recorded, they shall be deposited with the Bishop of this Church in Pennsylvania, to be transmitted to the next General Convention.

The House of Bishops informed this House, that they had concurred in the amendment, proposed by this House, to the proposed canon limiting the operation of the 4th canon of 1795.

The House adjourned to 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Saturday, 8 *o'clock*, A. M.

The House met, and the Chaplain read prayers.

The committee appointed to consider the memorials from certain churches in New Hampshire and Vermont, made the following report, which was read, and unanimously adopted; viz:

Report of the Committee.

It appears from the memorials of certain churches in the western part of the state of New Hampshire, and the eastern part of the state of Vermont, that, having agreed to and adopted the general constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, they are desirous of forming a junction, and uniting themselves, for the purpose of holding Conventions, and effecting a due organization of their churches; and, on account of the impracticability of joining with the other churches in said respective states, they are desirous of being considered as a separate district. Your committee are of opinion, that the 8th canon of 1795 militates against the wishes of said memorialists, but that their local situation requires a dispensation from the operation of said canon, more especially as many valuable tracts of land have been granted to the Episcopal Church in those towns, and others in the vicinity, which land requires the attention of a duly organized church for its preservation and improvement. Your committee are therefore of opinion, that, from their peculiar circumstances, they ought to be allowed to put themselves under the jurisdiction of a

Bishop of one of the neighboring states, until a Bishop shall be duly consecrated and settled in said states, as the only measure that can relieve them under their peculiar situation and circumstances.

Signed by order,

S. PARKER.

The above report was sent to the House of Bishops, and returned with their concurrence.

The Rev. Mr. Hobart proposed a canon, prescribing the mode of publishing authorized editions of the common prayer book, &c. which was read and adopted, and sent to the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops returned the foregoing canon, with an amendment, in which this House concurred.

The House of Bishops also returned to this House the resolution respecting the articles of Religion, with amendments, which were read and adopted. [*For this resolution respecting articles of religion, as agreed to by the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, see Appendix.*]

This House adopted, and sent to the House of Bishops, a resolution respecting certain spurious editions of the book of common prayer.

The House of Bishops informed this House, that they disagreed to the above named resolution, and proposed another as a substitute, which was adopted by this House.

The Rev. Dr. Smith proposed a canon, making an addition to the 1st canon of 1795, of Episcopal visitation; which was read and adopted, and sent to the House of Bishops.

The House of Bishops informed this House, that they concurred in the foregoing canon.

On motion of the Rev. Mr. Bend, *Resolved*, That the House of Bishops be requested to consider of and establish a course of theological studies proper for candidates for holy orders, and to report the same to the next General Convention.

The House of Bishops concurred in the foregoing resolution.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Mr. Bend, Rev. Mr. Ireland, (of Baltimore,) Rev. Mr. Kemp, Rev. Mr. Coleman, and Rev. Mr. Dashiell, be appointed a committee to report to this House, at the next General Convention, such additional hymns as they shall think are adapted to Christian worship.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Mr. Hobart, with the Secretary of this House, be a committee on the part of this House, to revise and publish the Journals, &c. of this Convention, and

also to superintend the printing of Bishop White's sermon, delivered before this Convention.

Ordered, That five hundred copies of the Journals, and the same number of the sermon, be printed.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the next meeting of the General Convention be held in the city of New York.

The House of Bishops concurred in the foregoing resolution.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Right Rev. Bishop Moore be requested to preach a sermon at the opening of the next General Convention; and that the Rev. Mr. Hobart inform the House of Bishops of the foregoing resolution, and that this House are ready to adjourn.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Mr. Waddell, Secretary of the House of Bishops, be requested to return the thanks of this Convention to the Governor, for the use of the rooms in the State House.

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be given to their President, the Rev. Dr. Beach, and to their Secretary and Chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Baldwin, for their attention and services.

The Rev. Mr. Hobart reported, that the Right Rev. Bishop Moore would comply with the request of this House, to preach a sermon at the opening of the next General Convention; and that the House of Bishops, having no further communications to make, concurred in the resolution of adjournment.

The House adjourned *sine die*.

Signed by order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

ABRAHAM BEACH, President.

Ashbel Baldwin, Secretary.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

TRENTON, STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

St. Michael's church, Sept. 8, 1801.

THIS being the day of the meeting of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Right Rev. Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, appeared, and appointed to meet to-morrow at 9 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, *Sept.* 9, 1801.

Present as before, together with the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett, of Maryland, and the Right Rev. Bishop Jarvis, of Connecticut.

sistent with ecclesiastical order, or with the practice of episcopal churches in any ages, or with the tenor of the office of consecration. Accordingly, while they sympathize most tenderly with their brother Bishop Provoost, on account of that ill health, and those melancholy occurrences which have led to the design in question, they judge it to be inconsistent with the sacred trust committed to them, to recognize the Bishop's act as an effectual resignation of his episcopal jurisdiction. Nevertheless, being sensible of the present exigencies of the church of New York, and approving of their making provision for the actual discharge of the duties of the episcopacy, the Bishops of this house are ready to consecrate to the office of Bishop, any person who may be presented to them with the requisite testimonials from the General and State Conventions; and of whose religious, moral, and literary character, due satisfaction may be given. But this house must be understood to be explicit in their declaration, that they shall consider such a person as assistant or co-adjuator Bishop during Bishop Provoost's life, although competent in point of character to all the episcopal duties; the extent in which the same shall be discharged by him, to be dependent on such regulations as expediency may dictate to the church in New York, grounded on the indisposition of Bishop Provoost, and with his concurrence.

The Secretary not being present, Bishop Jarvis is requested to deliver the above as a message to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and to furnish that house with a copy of Bishop Provoost's letter.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, informing, that the meetings of that house, during the session, are appointed to be at nine o'clock in the forenoon, and at four in the afternoon. This house agreed on the same hours, and informed the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies thereof, by the Rev. Dr. Parker.

Adjourned to 4 o'clock, P. M.

WEDNESDAY, *Sept.* 9, 4 *o'clock, P. M.*

The house met. Present as yesterday.

The Rev. Henry Waddell took his place as Secretary to this house.

The house agreed on a form and manner of setting forth the articles of religion, and agreed that the same be sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence; which was done accordingly.

The house then adjourned to nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

addition to, that part of the 4th canon of 1795 which had been repealed together with the repeal of the 4th canon of 1799, and requesting a conference on the subject with this house; whereupon the Right Rev. Bishop Claggett was appointed a committee on the part of this house, to meet and confer with a committee of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on the subject aforesaid.

The house adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

FRIDAY, *Sept.* 11, 9 *o'clock.*

The house met. Present as yesterday.

The house adjourned, in order to attend the consecration of the Bishop elect of the church in the state of New York.

FRIDAY, 4 *o'clock, P. M.*

The house met. Present as before.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Mr. Baldwin, with the following resolution:

Resolved, That it be recommended to the several State Conventions of this church, to cause as great a number as possible of the constitution and canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and of the constitution and canons of their respective churches, to be printed, and distributed among their congregations.

Whereupon it was *Resolved*, That this House do concur in the aforesaid resolution.

The Right Rev. Bishop Moore, who was consecrated this morning, appeared in the House and took his seat.

A proposed canon, limiting the operation of the 4th canon of 1795, was adopted, and sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies for their concurrence.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies returned the above canon as adopted by them, with an amendment, which was agreed to by this House.

The Right Rev. Bishop Claggett asked and obtained leave of absence.

The House adjourned to 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

SATURDAY, *Sept.* 12, 8 *o'clock, A. M.*

The House met. Present, the Right Rev. Bishop White, the Right Rev. Bishop Jarvis, and the Right Rev. Bishop Moore.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Smith, with a proposed canon, making an addition to the 1st canon of 1795. The proposed canon was agreed to by this House.

This House received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, naming a committee on their part for revising and publishing the Journals; and the Right Rev. Bishop Moore was appointed a committee on the part of this House.

A resolution was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, requesting the Rev. Mr. Waddell to return the thanks of this Convention to the Governor, for the use of the rooms in the State House.

This House concurred in the foregoing resolution.

A message was received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, informing this House that they are ready to adjourn.

Resolved, That this House are also ready to adjourn.

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be returned to the Rev. Mr. Waddell, their Secretary, for his attention and services.

The House rose.

Signed by order of the House of Bishops.

WILLIAM WHITE, Presiding Bishop.

Attest. Henry Waddell, Secretary.

The Certificate of the Consecration of the Right Rev. Bishop Moore, is as follows:

"KNOW all men by these presents, that we, William White, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Pennsylvania, presiding Bishop; Thomas John Claggett, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Maryland; and Abraham Jarvis, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Connecticut; under the protection of Almighty God, in St. Michael's Church, in the city of Trenton, on Friday, the 11th day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and one, did then and there rightly and canonically consecrate our beloved in Christ, Benjamin Moore, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church in the City of New York, of whose sufficiency in good learning, soundness in the faith, and purity of manners, we were fully ascertained, into the office of Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of New York; to which the said Benjamin Moore, D. D., hath been elected by the Convention of the said state, in consequence of the inability of the Right Rev. Bishop Provoost, and of his declining all episcopal jurisdict within the said state.

"In testimony whereof, we have signed our names, and caused our seals to be affixed.

"Given in the city of Trenton, this eleventh day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and one.

"WILLIAM WHITE, (L. S.)
"THOMAS J. CLAGGETT, (L. S.)
"ABRAHAM JARVIS." (L. S.)

APPENDIX.

Resolution of the Bishops, the Clergy, and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Convention, in the city of Trenton, the 12th day of September, in the year of our Lord, 1801, respecting articles of religion.

THE articles of Religion are hereby ordered to be set forth with the following directions, to be observed in all future editions of the same; that is to say—

The following to be the title; viz.

"Articles of religion, as established by the Bishops, the Clergy and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Convention, on the 12th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1801."

The articles to stand as in the book of common prayer of the church of England, with the following alterations and omissions, viz.

In the 8th article, the word three in the title, and the words three—Athanasius's creed, in the article, to be omitted, and the article to read thus:

ART. 8. *Of the creeds.*

"The Nicene creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture."

Under the title, "article 21," the following note to be inserted, viz.

"The 21st of the former articles is omitted, because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles."

The 35th article to be inserted with the following note; viz.

"This article is received in this church, so far as it declares the books of homilies to be an explication of Christian Doctrine, and instructive in piety and morals. But all references to the constitution and laws of England are considered as inapplicable to the circumstances of this church, which also suspends the order for the reading

of said homilies in churches, until a revision of them may conveniently be made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases, as from the local references."

The 36th article, entitled, "of consecration of Bishops and Minister's," to read thus:

"The book of consecration of Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons, as set forth by the General Convention of this church in 1792, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering; neither hath it any thing that, of itself, is superstitious and ungodly: and, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to said form, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered."

The 37th article to be omitted, and the following substituted in its place:

"*Of the power of the Civil Magistrate.*"

"The power of the Civil Magistrate extendeth to all men, as well Clergy as Laity, in all things temporal, but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted."

Adopted by the House of Bishops.

WILLIAM WHITE, D. D., Presiding Bishop.

Adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

ABRAHAM BEACH, D. D., President.

CANONS—PASSED 1801.

CANON 1. *Respecting those who discontinue all exercise of the Ministerial office without lawful cause, &c.*

If any person, having been ordained in this Church, or having been otherwise regularly ordained and admitted a Minister in this church, shall discontinue all exercise of the Ministerial office without lawful cause, or shall avow that he is no longer a Minister of this church, or shall live in the habitual disuse of the public worship, or of the holy eucharist, according to the offices of this church—such person, on due proof of the same, or on his own confession, shall be liable to be degraded from the ministry.

CANON II. *Limiting the operation of the 4th canon of* 1795.

The Bishop of this church, in any state, with the advice and consent of all the clerical members of the standing committee of his diocese,

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

RECENT INQUIRIES IN THEOLOGY: By Eminent English Churchmen: Being ESSAYS AND REVIEWS. Re-printed from the second London Edition. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. F. H. HEDGE, D. D. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 480.

Whatever may have been thought and said of "Broad Church" Theology before, nobody can complain that it is not sufficiently outspoken now. If the secret of the opposition of these men to Prof. Mansel needs explanation, we have it, at least in part, in the volume before us. The first principles of the two Philosophies, his and theirs, are wide apart as Heaven and Earth. *He* teaches, that man must believe what he cannot comprehend, and receive and obey what God reveals, because God has revealed it. *They* do not teach any such thing. Here is one radical distinction in the two systems. The Unitarian, Dr. Hedge, who wrote the Introduction to the American reprint of these "Broad Church" Essays, lately, in a published Sermon, puts this point clearly, as follows:

"Dr. Hedge proceeded to examine that singular acquiescence in something external,—the slavish reliance on a letter, to which the name and credit of Faith are commonly assigned. He shewed its danger and the ruin it must bring upon the Church; and then passed to answer the question where the infallible authority in religion must be. He answered frankly, that there is for man "*no infallible authority, out of the heart.*" The oracle within—the answer of the Holy Spirit, which the listening soul receives in the innermost recesses of known consciousness, is, for each individual, the high tribunal of last appeal. * * * And between Reason and Rome there is no middle ground. It is quite too late, then, it is impossible here for Protestantism to take any steps backward."

This boasted Reason first decides what it will, and what it will not believe, about God Himself; and then decides, what is, and what is not proper, for God to reveal. This is 'Broad Churchism.' It lacks the defiant tone, the vulgarity, the coarse profanity of the Infidelity of England, Scotland, and the Continent, a century ago; of Hume, and Voltaire, and D'Alembert, and the French Encyclopedists, but it is Infidelity, nevertheless, and none the less dangerous because it wears the guise of discipleship.

We can do no more now, than indicate, briefly, the contents of this volume. We will however say, in passing, that the publication of such a work, from such a source, marks an important epoch in the history of the English Church; and that the toleration of such views, by the authorities of the Church, would be a virtual abandonment of all the old tests of the Christian Faith. As to the moral honesty of men who can solemnly sign the Articles of the Church, and live on her emoluments, and still hold and teach such views as are contained in this volume—that, of course, is another matter.

The subjects discussed, are, 1, The Education of the World, by Frederick Temple, D. D.; 2, Bunsen's Biblical Researches, by Rowland Williams, D. D.; 3, On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity, by Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S.; 4,

Seances Historiques de Geneve—the National Church, by Henry Bristow Wilson, B. D.; 5, On the Mosaic Cosmogony, by C. W. Goodwin, M. A.; 6, Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688–1750, by Mark Pattison, B. C.; 7, On the Interpretation of Scripture, by Benjamin Jowett, M. A. All these writers are members of the Church of England. The Rev. Dr. Temple is Head Master of Rugby; the Rev. Dr. Williams is Vice-principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Baden Powell, lately deceased, was Professor of Mathematics in Oxford; the Rev. H. B. Wilson is Vicar of Great Staughton, Hunts; C. W. Goodwin, is a Layman, and the only Layman on the list; Rev. Mark Pattison is Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford; Rev. Benjamin Jowett is Regius Professor of Greek, and Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford.

Thus it will be seen, that all these writers are members of one or the other of the two distinguished Universities. Two of them were Professors in Oxford; and two are connected with other important Educational Institutions. The points, which these men discuss in their several Essays and Reviews, cover all that is distinctive in Christianity as a Supernatural System;—the Creation of the world; the Creation of Man; the Fall of Man; the Atonement; Inspiration; Miracles; the authority of the Creeds: in short, every thing beyond a bald and naked Deism is thus subjected to the irreverent speculations of men, who have only given an air of novelty to Errors, which, with a single exception, are almost as old as Christianity; and which have been refuted again and again. We are told in the Preface, that "the writers have written in entire independence of each other, and without concert or comparison." It is fair to say, that one of these writers, the Rev. Mr. Pattison, should not have been found in such company; but, without the above disclaimer, we might have supposed that these Essayists had divided up among them not only the outposts, but the subject matter of Christ's Gospel, in order to make one grand sweeping charge. To prove that we have not misrepresented this School of Theology, we give an extract, here and there, and refer our readers, for further evidence, to the volume itself.

Thus, see what Professor Baden Powell says on Miracles. "Questions of this kind are often perplexed for want of due atttention to the laws of human thought and belief, and of due distinction in ideas and terms. The proposition 'that an event may be so incredible intrinsically as to set aside any degree of testimony,' in no way applies to or affects the *honesty* or *veracity* of that testimony, or the reality of the *impressions* on the minds of the witnesses, so far as it relates to the matter of *sensible fact*, simply. It merely means this: that, from the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of *some* kind of mistake or deception *somewhere*, though we know not *where*, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in *the way* and from the *causes* assigned. * * * Testimony, after all, is but a second-hand assurance; it is but a blind guide; testimony can avail nothing against reason. The essential question of miracles stands quite apart from any consideration of *testimony;* the question would remain the same, if we had the evidence of our own senses to an alleged miracle, that is, to an extraordinary or inexplicable fact. It is not the *mere fact*, but *the cause*, or *explanation* of it, which is the point at issue. The case, indeed, of the *antecedent* argument of miracles is very clear, however little some are inclined to perceive it. In nature and from nature, by science and by reason, we neither have nor can possibly have any evidence of a *Deity working miracles;* for that we must go out of nature and beyond reason. If we could have any such evidence *from nature*, it could only prove extraordinary

natural effects, which would not be *miracles* in the old theological sense, as isolated, unrelated, and uncaused; whereas, no *physical* fact can be conceived as unique, or without analogy and relation to others, and to the whole system of natural causes." pp. 120, and 159. This is, of course, with all its verbiage, little more than the old infidel objection of David Hume. It is not an argument. It is mere assertion.

See what Professor Jowett says on Inspiration. "Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them different from that of preaching or teaching, which they daily exercised; nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity. * * * To attribute to St. Paul or the Twelve the abstract notion of Christian truth, which afterwards sprang up in the Catholic Church, is the same sort of anachronism as to attribute to them a system of philosophy. * * Still greater difficulties would be introduced into the Gospels by the attempt to identify them with the creeds."—pp. 379, 389.

See, too, how Dr. Rowland Williams treats the Messianic Prophecies; as Ps. ii. 7: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Ps. xxxii. 20: "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken." Ps. xxii. 16: "They pierced my hands and my feet;" and Isaiah lii. and liii: in which the Priesthood of Christ and the Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross are taught. In the whole range of Infidel writings, there is nothing more revolting and shocking to a Christian heart, than this entire Essay of Rowland Williams, when its evident design is clearly understood.

On the Origin of the Human Race, the Rev. Mr. Wilson says: "Some may consider the descent of all mankind from Adam and Eve as an undoubted historical fact; others may rather perceive in that relation a form of narrative, into which, in early ages, tradition would easily throw itself spontaneously."—p. 226. And Professor Jowett says: "It is possible, and may one day be known, that mankind spread, not from one, but from many centres over the globe."—p. 384.

Our object, in this brief notice, is to show what the character of this "Broad Church" Theology is. As to its *origin*, there is no question. It is an attempt to graft into the mind of the English Church a habit of thinking and reasoning, foreign to the whole genius of the Church, and thoroughly destructive of her Faith, and of all Faith. It is German Rationalism; nothing more, and nothing less. A new German Magazine, called *Englisch-Theologische Forschungen und Kritiken* (English Theological Researches and Criticisms,) edited by Dr. Heidenheim, in speaking of these very men, says: "they have proved themselves to be great writers, and in their works we find wrought out the opinions of our German theologians."

Nor, let it be said, that there is no danger of this Infidel Philosophy pervading our own Church. There is danger. It is the Philosophy of Naturalism, always and everywhere. It is held, and taught, and preached, and published, all about us. Saddest of all, it comes to us with the *imprimatur* of those great Universities, where we have been wont to look for learning and wisdom. Our duty as Churchmen is to meet this so-called Philosophy, boldly, in the outset; to call things by their right names; to label it *poison* and to treat it as such; to face fundamental Error like men pledged, before God, to contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

We will not leave this volume of "Essays and Reviews" without saying, that the learning of these men has been greatly overrated. There is a supercilious, patron-

izing air, a sort of literary cockneyism, a tone of vast pretension, in several of these papers; and yet some of them, especially that of Dr. Temple, are evidently the production of mere sciolists. Genuine scholars never write so. The really learned men of our age find no such objections to Miracles; no such contradictions in the Scriptures; no such conflict between Science and Revelation. Archbishop Whately hits off the inflated style of these men very well. "These persons have long been accustoming their disciples to admire, as a style truly philosophical, what can hardly be described otherwise than as a certain haze of words, imperfectly understood, through which some remote ideas, scarcely distinguishable in their outlines, *loom* as it were upon the view, in a kind of dusky grandeur, which vastly exaggerates their proportions."

THE WORKS OF FRANCIS BACON, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Albans, and Lord High Chancellor of England. Collected and Edited by James Spedding, M. A., Robert Leslie Ellis, M. A., and Douglas Denon Heath. Vols. XI. and XII., being Vols. I. and II. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Brown & Taggard. 12mo., 1860. pp. 461, 454.

The enterprising publishers most certainly deserve, not only the gratitude, but the coöperation of all scholars and thinkers in our country, in their republication of the Works of Lord Bacon. The influence, which Bacon has exerted, has been greater, probably, than that of any other uninspired man. In Physics and Metaphysics, in Morals, in Social Order, and even in Religion, the Baconian Philosophy has wrought incalculable changes. It has done vast good, and almost infinite mischief. The limits and the true province of Induction is one of the great problems of the age. The publishers, in their beautiful edition, have commenced with the Literary Works of Lord Bacon; his Philosophical Works are to follow; and the whole will be completed in fifteen volumes. The introductory volume contains the History of the Reign of King Henry VII., with valuable Appendices; also, the Beginning of the History of the Reign of Henry VIII.; the Beginning of the History of Great Britain; and his Discourse on the Life of Queen Elizabeth. These, though valuable, (and his History of Henry VII. is the basis of nearly every History of that period since written,) are yet the least important of his works.

The Second Volume in this series includes the Memorial of Prince Henry; the Character of Julius Cæsar; the Additions and Corrections of Camden's Annals; the Civil and Moral Essays, which have passed through almost innumerable Editions, and have been translated into several Modern Languages. These Essays are in the form of Apothegms, and are upon subjects, which, as Bacon says, "come home to men's business and bosoms," and they have had great popularity. The volume commences, also, the "*De Sapientia Veterum*," or, "Of the Wisdom of the Ancients." The Key of this work was Bacon's theory, that, long before the days of Homer, there was upon the earth a period of high intellectual cultivation, now forgotten. Although our modern wiseacres, and especially our scientific men of the Development School, are scouting this idea, there is a growing conviction among scholars, we mean those who are really scholars, that Bacon's theory is the only tenable one. Dr. South, of course, overstated the matter when he said, that "an Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise." There is a great principle involved in this question, which some of our modern Infidels are sagacious enough to appreciate. It is high time for Christian scholars to dis-

card the old heathen notion, the *mutum et turpe pecus*, or else to be ashamed of themselves. It is as false to History and Philosophy, as it is to Revelation.

Messrs. Brown and Taggard's edition is one of the best specimens of typography that our country has yet produced. Mr. T. H. Pease, of New Haven, will furnish the work at publishers' prices.

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY; Including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. By HENRY HART MILMAN, D. D., Dean of St. Paul's. In Eight Volumes: Vol. I., 8vo. pp. 554. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

It is now more than six years since this great work of Dean Milman was issued from the London press, and the rank, which it already holds among scholars, fully justifies the American publishers in the large expenditures, upon which they have ventured in bringing out this new and elegant edition, the first volume of which is before us. We certainly shall do what we can to aid them in its circulation; and we earnestly advise our readers, Clerical and Lay, instead of wasting their time and money in mental dissipation over the fashionable trash of the day, to commence at once with these volumes, and to read them thoroughly as they shall appear. At the same time, our conviction as to the character of Milman as a historian is very decided, and we shall criticise this history with the utmost freedom before we are through with it. It has a certain distinct character; it is unlike any other Church history that has yet been written; the author's stand-point, ideal, and method, are emphatically his own; and on all these, we shall have something to say by-and-by. All that we design now, is, to call attention to the work, and to urge our readers to procure it and to read it.

Dean Milman is already well known in this country as an Author. His "History of the Jews," which had passed to a second edition in London, in 1830, and his admirable and well-guarded edition of "Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," are well known to many of our readers, and they indicate the preparation, the years of careful investigation, which could qualify him for the great work of his life. His "History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire," or down to near the beginning of the fifth century, was republished in this country, with a Preface and Notes, by the late Rev. Dr. Murdock, in 1841, and formed an introduction to the work which is now before us, which is devoted mainly to the re-creation of European Society, under the influence of Christianity.

The work is issued in a beautiful crown octavo, and will be completed in eight volumes, each consisting of about six hundred pages. In typography, paper, &c., the work is all that the most fastidious can desire, and yet it is issued at a very cheap rate.

COMMENTARY ON ECCLESIASTES, with other Treatises. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D. D., Professor of Theology, Berlin. Translated from the German by D. W. SIMON. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. 8vo., pp. 488.

Hengstenberg is a Layman; is Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University at Berlin; is the head and leader of what is called the "High Church Lutheran party;" has opposed himself resolutely to the more moderate views of the Government in respect to religious toleration; in his numerous writings, he has

lashed the monstrous heresies of his times, with the most unsparing severity; is thoroughly orthodox, after the Lutheran stamp, on such points as the Church, Ministry, and Sacraments; and is, withal, deeply learned, and, in the field of critical exegesis, and in force and energy of style, he has probably few equals, and no superior. As a Commentator, he has been a voluminous writer; and his Expositions of the Messianic Prophecies, and of the Book of Psalms, have been translated into English, and have been well received. The volume before us contains not only a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, filling nearly half of the book, but also Prolegomena to the Song of Solomon, and Essays on the Prophet Isaiah, on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture, on the Jews, and on the Christian Church. On the subject of Sacrifices, we quote a single passage: "Regarding all that is written concerning the sin-offerings of the Old Testament in this light, we shall be in a high degree affected and benefited thereby. We shall be penetrated by a conviction that sin may not be treated lightly; we shall feel that we cannot help ourselves to the forgiveness of sins, as we like; that, according to God's eternal order, there is no forgiveness without blood; that it is a crime to think of presenting ourselves before the holy God and His strict judgment seat with other pretended offerings; that the blood of atonement is the real mark of distinction between the world and the people of God; and, finally, that all separations from the world which are not rooted in this blood of atonement must come to a miserable end. A consideration of the Old Testament sin-offering will force us nearer and nearer to Christ and His cross, and bring us into more intimate union with Him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood."

The writings of such a man, and on such subjects, some of which are among the most difficult in Holy Scripture, will receive the attention of all close students of the Inspired Word. While he will be found generally orthodox, he holds some peculiar views; as, for example, upon the Millennium, the restoration of the Jews, &c., &c. The publishers, who are distinguishing themselves for the solid and substantial works which they are offering to the public, are sparing no expense to present them in an attractive form.

THE VOCABULARY OF PHILOSOPHY, Mental, Moral, and Metaphysical, with Quotations and References for the Use of Students. By WILLIAM FLEMING, D. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. From the Second revised and enlarged London Edition. With an Introduction, Chronology of the History of Philosophy brought down to 1860, Biographical Index, Synthetical Tables, and other additions, by CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Translator of Tholuck on the Gospel of St. John. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 661.

Dr. Fleming, the author and compiler of this Vocabulary, is abundantly competent to prepare such a work as is here attempted for the first time, we believe, in our language. It is much more than a mere definition of the terms in Philosophy, which students meet with in the course of their reading and studies; in the course of his illustrations, the author gives, in no small extent, the history of these terms, and so of Philosophy itself. Valuable assistance has also been rendered him by Mr. Haywood, Mr. Morell, and Prof. M'Cosh, of Queen's College, Belfast. The work, however, of Dr. Fleming, illustrates Philosophy as its terms are understood and used in the English and Scottish Schools. The American Editor, Dr. Krauth,

has added to the bulk of the volume, and somewhat to its utility, by introducing some of the terms used by modern German Philosophers; also a Chronological Table, &c. and, more especially, by the preparation of a "Biographical Index of Authors and of Proper Names," covering seventy closely filled pages. In this, every author quoted, or alluded to in the Vocabulary, is given, with a pretty full list of the works which they wrote, titles, dates, &c. The volume cannot fail to have a very considerable, and we hope a large circulation. Every thinking man, and especially every public man, will be glad to have at hand a *Vade Mecum*, where the philosophical terms, which he meets with every day, and which sometimes he must notice, are clearly explained. Such are *Realism*, *Nominalism*, *Idealism*, *Rationalism*, *Subjectivism*, *Optimism*, &c., &c., &c. Such of our Clergy as derive their *pabulum* from *Harper's Magazine*, and the *Ledger*, will find this a very stupid book.

AN AMERICAN DICTIONARY of the English Language, by NOAH WEBSTER, LL. D., revised and enlarged by CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, Professor in Yale College, to which are now added Pictorial Illustrations, Tables of Synonyms, &c. Springfield, Mass. 1859.

This work has been so long and so favorably known wherever the English language is read or spoken, as to require no commendation from us. A volume of which Lord Brougham could say, "It has come to be a necessity to every educated man," deserves the great success and extended circulation which it has attained.

The edition recently published embodies some new features which may properly receive a brief notice. It is not a new *revision* of the whole work; that yet remains to be accomplished. But a great amount of new and valuable matter has been added to that previously contained in the volume. To name these new features in the order in which they occur as we open it, they consist of a series of Pictorial Illustrations, fifteen hundred in number; a table of Synonyms, discriminated with great care by the editor, the late Professor Goodrich; an Appendix of words not previously inserted or of recent origin, to the number of more than nine thousand; a Pronouncing Vocabulary of the proper names of distinguished individuals of modern times; a collection of quotations, words, phrases, proverbs and colloquial expressions from the Latin, French, Italian and Spanish, rendered into English; Tables of Abbreviations and Arbitrary signs in common use, with their explanations; and the Peculiar Use of words and terms in the Bible.

A few remarks now, as to some of these new features. Of the Pictorial Illustrations we may say, in general, that they are very striking and well executed. They enable one to take in at a glance what it would often require many lines to describe in words. They supplement a definition with great clearness and distinctness. We might perhaps take exception to some of them as not correct in arrangement and classification, but are not disposed to be over-critical where so much real excellence appears. Of the Table of discriminated Synonyms, we cannot but express high admiration. The distinctions are eminently just, though brief in statement, and must greatly assist those who wish to understand the shades of meaning between words usually and loosely regarded as synonymous. We could wish the Table larger, so that more words of this class might be found here, thus discriminated for the benefit of both writers and speakers.

The Appendix of new words is a feature of great practical value. We find many here, for which one may look in vain in some later Dictionaries. Some of

them may be of questionable character, but the mass consists of words clearly belonging to the English language in its present state, and, as such, may rightly claim their place on the pages of a Dictionary.

The Pronouncing Vocabulary of Proper Names of distinguished men of modern times meets a want, that has often been expressed by many unacquainted with the language to which these names belong.

The explanations given of phrases, proverbs, etc., as also of abbreviations and arbitrary signs, are no less a convenience and benefit to multitudes.

To this notice, too brief to do justice to the work before us, we can only add, that these new features combine to render this edition a decided improvement on those that have gone before, and especially worthy of continued confidence, and a widened circulation. As being such we commend it to our readers.

PROLEGOMENA LOGICA: An Inquiry into the Psychological Character of Logical Processes. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., LL.D., Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford. First American, from the Second English edition, corrected and enlarged. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. pp. 291.

This is not a treatise on Psychology alone, or on Logic alone. The main object of this work is to show what are the relations existing between Logic and Psychology. A failure to recognize these relations is the fatal defect in what is termed the Kantian Philosophy. Here is where Professor Mansel and Sir William Hamilton first start in their opposition to the Ethics of Modern German Philosophy; for the subject matter of discussion covers of necessity the whole field of mental operations, in Metaphysics, Moral Philosophy, and Revealed Religion. Some of the objectors to Prof. Mansel have done him great injustice, in not keeping in mind certain elementary principles which lie at the basis of all his investigations. Before assailing his Philosophy, if they would define their own position in respect to his views of the powers and capacities of the human mind, they would do their readers good service.

LECTURES ON LOGIC. By SIR WM. HAMILTON, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Edited by the REV. HENRY L. MANSEL, B. D., LL. D., and JOHN VEITCH, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Royal 8vo. pp. 731. 1860.

We have expressed ourselves so fully on our previous pages in respect to Sir William Hamilton's method of reasoning, that we need only very briefly call attention to these Lectures. They were commenced on his taking the professional chair in 1836, and were repeated, with some alterations, up to the time of his death in 1856; and they express, therefore, his mature convictions. The Editors tell us that the author availed himself of the labors of previous writers, and especially "that to the works of the German logicians of the present century, particularly to those of Krug and Esser, these Lectures are under special obligations." The Appendix, of nearly two hundred pages, is made up of papers of Sir William Hamilton, of great interest to the select few, though perhaps of less value to the general scholar. The Index is very full and complete.

THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS. By RUDOLF STIER, Doctor of Theology, Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkenditz. Volumes VII. and VIII. Trans-

lated from the Second revised and enlarged German Edition. By Rev. William B. Pope. New Edition. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. 8vo. pp. 490, 458.

The very objections which the modern school of Commentators in Germany bring against this work of Stier are, as far as they go, the highest possible testimony in its favor. Without following the Primitive method of Interpretation, he yet so far sympathises with it, as to find, everywhere, in the Old Testament and the New, that deeper meaning, which the worldling understands not; he evinces the inward conscious certainty, that indeed "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of Prophecy." But this is a method of interpretation which the obedient, penitent, loving heart alone can follow. Undevout Science ridicules and hates it; and its rules of criticism may sometimes perplex it. And yet the blessed Jesus Himself taught this method of understanding His Word; "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine."

These two volumes (bound in one large octavo,) are devoted to "the Words of the Passion," and "the Words of the Risen and Ascending Lord." We are sure that both Clergy and Laity will find in this exposition of our Saviour's Words, great depths of meaning, of which they never dreamed before; and, from Advent to Whitsunday especially, it will be found a good book for the study and the closet. On certain great test questions, as the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Sacraments, the Churchman will find little that is not most thoroughly orthodox. It is, in all respects, a different work from those popular shallow Commentaries, which fill the shelves of our modern libraries.

THE ROCK OF AGES; or, Scripture Testimony to the One Eternal Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M. A. With an Introduction, by Rev. F. D. Huntington, D. D., Rector of Emanuel Church, Boston. Late Preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals, in Harvard College. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 214.

There are three strongly marked characteristics of this volume. 1st. It is prepared by one who had passed years of incessant spiritual conflict in respect to this great question, the Divinity of the Son of God. 2nd. It is such a grouping, a masterly presentation of the Scripture argument on the Trinity, as we have never seen elsewhere. And 3d. It exhibits that Doctrine, not in a dry speculative manner, addressed to the intellect alone; but as a Doctrine which meets, and which alone meets, the profound, awful questions of our moral being. In his able and manly Introduction, the Rev. Dr. Huntington, who has himself lingered around and gazed upon this great Mystery of our Religion as few men in modern times have done, pays to this work the highest possible tribute of his admiration. He says, "Conclusive as the Biblical proof had appeared to us, we acknowledge that its vast sweep and marvelous power had never been felt as they were, after following through these stately and beautiful lines of demonstration." The work will do vast good. It will guide the enquiring and strengthen the weak. It is a book for the closet and the study, a book to keep, and a book to give away. We hope the "Church Book Society" will place it on its list, and help to circulate it over the length and breadth of the land.

SCIENCE IN THEOLOGY. Sermons preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before the University. By ADAM S. FARRAR, M. A., etc. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860. pp. 250.

We confess that we do not like the title of this Volume. Even the ordinary terms, "Scientific Theology," and "Systematic Divinity," we have an aversion to. There is throughout the American Church a growing aversion, not to Creeds, not to dogmatic teaching, but to that metaphysical interpretation of Creeds which is usually known under the term, Scientific Theology. This tendency to substitute Interpretation of Doctrine for the doctrine itself, is in its reaction the source of half the infidelity of modern times, and is one main cause of the tendency in certain quarters to give up all dogmatic teaching whatsoever. We wish Mr. Farrar had borne stronger testimony against this mischievous habit, so tempting to a certain class of minds. It is the root-principle of sectism, in the Church and out of it. His object is to trace, historically, and almost from the very dawn of Christianity, the attempts to harmonize the great Doctrines of Revelation with various Schools of Philosophy, as the Alexandrian; the Neo-Platonic; the Nominalism and Realism of the Schoolmen; Physics and Metaphysics; Intellectualism; and Positivism. The titles of his nine Discourses will show the breadth of his field. I. On the gradual Discovery of the Divine Attributes through Scripture and Science. II. Divine Providence in General Laws. III. Divine Benevolence in the Economy of Pain. IV. Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy. V. The Doctrine of the Trinity. VI. The Atonement. VII. Laws in the Life Spiritual. VIII. The Gifts of the Holy Ghost. IX. Providence in Political Revolutions.

The tone of Mr. Farrar's discourses is unexceptionable; these great themes are handled with ability and vigor; and our Clergy, especially, will find them rich in learning and exceedingly suggestive.

THE LAKE REGIONS OF CENTRAL AFRICA. A Picture of Exploration. By RICHARD F. BURTON, Capt. H. M. I. Army; Fellow and Gold Medalist of the Royal Geographical Society. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 572. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck.

Capt. Burton, at the request of the Royal Geographical Society of London, received leave of absence from his regiment in India, for two years, to undertake an expedition of exploration into the regions of Equatorial Africa. Judging from his Appendix, in which we have a statement of his misunderstandings with public functionaries in the settlements of his accounts; and, judging also from his quarrel (if we must so call it,) with Capt. Spekes, his companion in his travels, we conclude that Capt. Burton, like most adventurers, is a man of strongly marked individualities of character. But he evidently is, as the English say, clever, and his volume gives important information of a region of country hitherto little known. Marching a thousand miles into the heart of the country, he visited and explored the great Central Lake, Tanganyika, lying between S. lat. 3° 35′ and S. lat. 7° 20′; in length about two hundred and fifty miles; with a mean width of about twenty miles; and having an area of about five thousand square miles. This Lake receives and absorbs the river system of that large portion of Central Africa. Though it has no outlet, its waters are not saline. He also describes the circumjacent country, and this portion of his work is specially interesting and valuable. His companion,

Capt. Spekes, visited the more northern Lake, Nyanza, a description of which appeared in Blackwood's Magazine in Oct. 1859; but Capt. Burton is certain that it has no connection with the River Nile, as has been lately maintained by Capt. Spekes. In respect to the people of East Africa, and the prospect of commercial relations with them, the Captain's testimony is decided enough to cool the most sanguine. He landed at Zanzibar Island, on his return home, March, 4, 1859, having been exposed more than two years to every variety of hardship and suffering; of which, however, he utters, we are glad to see, not a word of complaint. The volume has an elaborate map; numerous illustrations; two Appendices, one of them very valuable; and a copious Index.

TRAVELS IN THE REGIONS OF THE UPPER AND LOWER AMOOR, AND THE RUSSIAN ACQUISITIONS ON THE CONFINES OF INDIA AND CHINA. With adventures among the Mountain Kirghis, and the Manjours, Manyargs, Toungouz, Touzemtz, Goldi, and Gelyaks; the Hunting and Pastoral Tribes. By THOMAS WITLAM ATKINSON, F. G. S., F. R. G. S., Author of "Oriental and Western Siberia." With a Map and numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 448. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck.

The constant aggressions on the part of Russia, by which she is pushing her boundary line farther and farther toward the South in Asia, seem to have alarmed the English people and hence to have given to this work of Mr. Atkinson extraordinary interest. The Narrative lacks order and continuity, so that it is sometimes difficult to follow him even with the aid of his Map. His description of his journey from Semipalatinsk over the Altai mountains, and through the regions of Central Asia to the head waters of the Amoor, and through the country which that vast river drains, is graphically written, and is full of interest and information. It is a country of wonderful resources, which Russia seems destined to develop and control.

LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN A. QUITMAN, Major General, U. S. A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi. By J. F. H. CLAIBORNE. In two Volumes, 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. pp. 400, 392. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck.

The Life and Correspondence of Gen. Quitman, as given by Mr. Claiborne, is an attractive work. Besides the interest which attaches to a well written biography, and besides the information contained on many points in our National history, and especially concerning the Mexican War, the work deserves to be read for other reasons, in all parts of our country. Our pages, of course, are closed to the introduction of party politics; and hence we cannot discuss certain questions of political economy with which Gen. Quitman has been more or less identified for the last fifteen or twenty years. But he was not only a brave soldier, he was a bold, frank, out-spoken man; he held no opinions which he dared not avow, and the consequences of which he was not prepared to meet. His Funeral Sermon, by his Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Perry, of Natchez, shows him to have been a man respected and beloved in all the relations of private life. Almost his last words were, as his daughter said to him, "My Father, look to JESUS; He is your only hope." "Yes, Yes," answered the dying parent, "I know it. He is my trust." He died July 17th, 1858, aged fifty-nine years. Mr. Claiborne has done his work with ability and skill.

strongly marked, and, judging from the volumes before us, the work undertaken by his son cannot fail to attract great interest throughout the whole Church. We observe, in the *Church Journal*, a Card from the Rev. Mr. Doane, correcting the statement in the Memoir that Bishop Doane was, "in connection with the Rev. Dr. Upfold, *the founder* of St. Luke's Church, New York." It seems that the parish was founded by Bishop Upfold in 1820, several months before Bishop Doane's Ordination to the Diaconate, and that Bishop Doane was then the Assistant to Bishop Upfold, in the Parish.

UNITARIANISM DEFINED: The Scripture Doctrine of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. A Course of Lectures by Frederick A. Farley, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Saviour, Brookline. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 272.

So far as Dr. Farley attempts in this volume by solid argument to refute the great Doctrine of the Trinity, we need only refer to the clear statement of that Doctrine, and of the evidence on which we receive it, in the last No. of this Review. So far as he discusses other correlative questions, as the character of Human Nature, the Atonement, &c., much of what he says has no pertinence, except as directed against an extreme Calvinism, out of which indeed Boston Unitarianism and New Haven Taylorism have both naturally grown. These Lectures are discursive, are common-place in their matter and method, and are most noticeable as witnessing to an evident necessity of quieting that spirit of enquiry which prevails to so large an extent among our modern Unitarians.

FARADAY ON THE PHYSICAL FORCES. A Course of Six Lectures on the Various Forces of Matter, and their Relations to each Other. By MICHAEL FARADAY, D. C. L., F. R. S., Fullerton Professor of Chemistry, Royal Institution. Edited by William Crookes, F. C. S. With numerous Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 198.

Since Sir Humphrey Davy, no one has been listened to at the Royal Institution at London with more favor than Professor Faraday. These Lectures were delivered before a Juvenile auditory, and treat of the simplest elements of this branch of Physical Science. They are upon the Force of Gravitation—Cohesion—Chemical Affinity—Heat—Magnetism—Electricity—the Correlation of the Physical Forces—Lighthouse Illumination, &c.

THE LIFE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON. By EDWARD EVERETT. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 348.

This "Life of Washington" was first written for the "*Encyclopedia Britannica*." It has evidently been prepared with great care, and it may well go down to future ages as giving an almost perfect view of one whom Mr. Everett pronounces, "of all men that have ever lived, THE GREATEST OF GOOD MEN AND THE BEST OF GREAT MEN." As Washington's early history was blended with the ante-Revolutionary fortunes of our country, so his whole career is more than the life of an individual. In its style, the work is well nigh faultless. There is no attempt in it at display; but there is an elegant simplicity, and, at the same time, a masterly grouping of prominent events in Washington's Life, giving to the reader unity and completeness of

impression. We hope the Volume will go into all the School and Family Libraries of the country, and be read and re-read by every child of the Republic.

The Appendix contains an able paper from Dr. Jackson, of Boston, showing that the treatment of Gen. Washington's last and fatal disease, by his family physician, Dr. Craik, was entirely judicious. The Appendix also, with other things of interest, has a copy of the will of Mrs. Washington, never before published.

LIFE OF GENERAL WASHINGTON. By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. Author of Rockford Parish, &c. &c.

Mr. Norton has done, and has done well, the noblest work to which as yet he has devoted his pen, in preparing for the youth of our country a "LIFE OF GENERAL WASHINGTON." It is full and satisfactory in just that respect in which Everett's graceful biography is defective. Throughout the narrative, which is very well written, Mr. Norton constantly bears testimony to that one element in Washington's character, which emphatically made him what he was,—his personal piety. That Washington was a religious man is unquestionable. That he was less demonstrative at times than might now be wished, (and yet Bishop White's testimony on this point has been, we think, greatly misinterpreted,) may be accounted for from various considerations. There are some facts, and the most decisive ones in his religious life, which have never yet been published; and which we trust the gentleman who, as we know, has them in his possession, will not fail to give to the world. To Mr. Norton, and to the "Church Book Society," the whole Church is greatly indebted for this beautiful volume, which cannot fail to do great good.

THE BENEFIT OF CHRIST'S DEATH: Or the Glorious Riches of God's Free Grace, which every true believer receives by Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Originally written in Italian, by Aonio Paleario. Now reprinted from an ancient English Translation. With an Introduction by Rev. John Ayer, M. A., Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead, England, &c. Boston; Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 160.

The history of this little work is somewhat interesting. Macaulay, in his article on Ranke's History of the Popes, refers to the unsparing rigor and vigor with which the Inquisition in the sixteenth century hunted out and destroyed copies of heretical books. "One book in particular," he says, "entitled 'Of the Benefits of the Death of Christ,' had this fate. It was written in Tuscan, and many times reprinted, and was eagerly read in every part of Italy. But the Inquisitors detected in it the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith alone. They proscribed it; and it is now as utterly lost as the Second Decade of Livy." It seems, however, that an English translation of this treatise was made some time during the first half of the sixteenth century. The fourth edition of it, published in 1638, was discovered lately by an English clergyman, the Rev. John Ayres, who immediately published it, with a notice of the author. The American edition is an exact reprint of this curious and interesting volume.

THE WOMAN IN WHITE. A Novel, by WILKIE COLLINS. Illustrated by John McLenan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 260.

A Man. By Rev. J. D. Bell. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1860. 12mo. pp. 462.

The work is in Two Parts. In the first are considered the higher possibilities of the ordinary class of minds, in the pursuit of knowledge and manly character. The second mainly consists of essays on Aspiration, on Genius, on the Discoverer, on the Inventor, on the Writer, and on the three inspirations—that of the Poet, that of the Orator, and that of the Hero. The radical defect in the work is its humanitarian basis, and its ignoring the supernatural element which the Fall of Man has rendered necessary in reaching the "higher possibilities" of which our nature is thus alone capable. It belongs to the modern School of Philanthrophy and of Human Progress, of which the country is full; and of which all past history is pregnant with illustrations.

Historical Pictures Retouched. A Volume of Miscellanies. In Two Parts. Part I. Studies. Part II. Studies. By Mrs. Dall, Author of "Woman's Right to Labor." Boston: Walker, Wise & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 402.

Such a work as this, we suppose, could not have been written in this country, except in Boston. The practical exhibition of its ethics, and a popular defense of its aims, can be found for example in New York, and in a manner which everybody can understand; but, to reduce the cravings of such a depraved instinct to a beautiful system, to throw around it the aesthetics of poetry and imagination, to lift such a vicious theory into respectability, where all its revolting features shall be concealed, and even admired, to do this clearly, and by the pen of a woman too, is an attempt which could only have been done successfully in a certain locality.

The Four Georges. Sketches of Manners, Morals, Court and Town life. By W. M. Thackeray, Author, &c. &c. &c. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 241. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck.

These famous Lectures of Mr. Thackeray on the Four Georges are crammed full of the bitterest satire; they fairly bristle with scorn and sarcasm, as they show up the life and manners of these Hanoverian Kings and their favorites to public contempt. As Americans, and especially as American Churchmen, we of course can have no great amount of sympathy for these royal sinners, little as we admire the taste which revels in painting to the life such social meanness and corruption. The picture of George III is relieved of the grosser deformities; still it is as unlovely as it can be. The great trouble with Mr. Thackeray is, that he is an incorrigible cynic; his clergymen are all hypocrites, and his women are no better than they should be. Still, even turkey buzzards, we suppose, were not made in vain.

Italy in Transition. Public Scenes and Private Opinions in the Spring of 1860. Illustrated by Official Documents from the Papal Archives of the Revolted Legations. By William Arthur, A. M., Author of a "Mission to the Mysore," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 429.

The author traveled through the States of Central Italy, in the Spring of 1860, and while the vote on annexation to Piedmont was being taken. As a picture of real life in Italy, and so as authorizing a decided opinion as to her prospects for the

future, the book is valuable. The good order of the people during scenes of great public excitement; the utter and universal indifference of the people as to the Pope's excommunication; their ignorance of the Bible, of the Reformed Church of England; their contempt and hatred for the priests, &c. &c., are described cleverly. The book is very well written.

THE FLORENCE STORIES. By JACOB ABBOTT. Excursion to the Orkney Islands. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1861. 16mo. pp. 252.

The story of a voyage across the Atlantic in a Cunard steamer, and of a journey through Scotland to the Orkney Islands, Jacob Abbott tells in a way to combine real information with an interest that never tires.

CHAPTERS ON WIVES. By MRS. ELLIS, Author of "Mothers of Great Men." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 358.

A writer says, and very justly, "These stories of English home-life will be as welcome to American wives and husbands as to those for whom they were written. Mrs. Ellis has great skill in the construction of her plot, and, while thus able to command the interest of the reader, she has that right conception of womanly duties, and of the proper use of those trials and sufferings which are incident to every married life, which cannot help but strengthen and benefit the character of her readers."

ODD PEOPLE. A popular description of singular races of men. By Capt. MAYNE REID. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 445.

These "Odd People," are the Bushmen, the Amazonians, the Esquimaux, the Beheaders, the Man-Eaters, the Dirt-Eaters, the Camanches, the Root-Diggers, the Palm Dwellers, the Laplanders, the Mud-bedaubers, the Patagonians, the Fuegian Dwarfs, &c. The writer is one of our most popular authors, and his curious volume is well worth reading.

HOW TO ENJOY LIFE: Or Physical and Mental Hygiene. By WILLIAM M. CORNELL, M. D. Philadelphia: James Challen & Sons. 1860. 12mo. pp. 360.

The former work, "Clerical Health," of which this is an enlargement, was well received, and the present volume cannot fail to be very useful. Professor Cornell has made Physiology and Hygiene and Nervous Diseases his specialty; he certainly is no quack, but a man of good sense and large observation, and his treatise deserves to be read, not only by the Clergy and their families, but by a great many other people. His last chapter, on "Clergymen's Wives," is particularly rich.

OLD MACKINAW: Or the Fortress of the Lakes, and its Surroundings. By W. P. STRICKLAND. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1860. 12mo. pp. 404.

There is scarcely a spot in our whole country which has in it, and around it, and concerning it, so much of romance as Mackinaw. Its name, in the Indian tongue, signifies "the dwelling-place of the Great Genii." Its thousand Indian legends, the historic associations of such names as Marquette, and LaSalle, and Joliet, and

the wonderful beauty of the place itself and its surroundings, all give it a charm to every one who is not a perfect Gadgrind. The work has a Map, several illustrations, and valuable tables of statistics, showing the agricultural, mineral and social wealth and prosperity of the West.

HISTORY OF INDEPENDENCE HALL FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME; Embracing Biographies of the Immortal Signers of the Declaration of Independence, with Historical Sketches and the Sacred Relics preserved in that Sanctuary of American Freedom. By D. W. BELISLE. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1859. 12mo. pp. 396.

The biographical sketches of the immortal Men who signed the Declaration of Independence, and the description of the sacred relics which are deposited in this old Cradle and Temple of American Liberty, render this a work of great interest and inestimable value. The biographies are very well written, and interwoven are many curious incidents in our early national history. It is a national work.

THE BIBLE AND SOCIAL REFORM: Or the Scriptures as a Means of Civilization. By R. H. TYLER, A. M., Fulton, N. Y. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. 1860. 12mo. pp. 354.

The object of the writer is less specific than might be inferred from his title. He does not discuss any *theory* of Social Reform, but plants himself upon the broad ground of the power and influence of the Bible in the Civilization of the World. The author discusses the genuineness of the Sacred Writings, and proves that the Bible is a means of Civilization, and that the highest Civilization is where the Bible is most free; and that Civilization always follows the introduction of the Scriptures. The Author is a lawyer, he writes clearly, and his argument is unanswerable; that is, as far as it goes.

OUR YEAR: A Child's Book in Prose and Verse. By Miss MULOCK, Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." Illustrated by Clarence Dobell. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 297.

We hardly need say that Miss Mulock's work is one of real merit and will be an attractive present for the Holidays.

THE REV. JAMES W. ROGERS' Address at the Laying of the Corner Stone of the Church of the Advent, Nashville, Tenn., May 22, 1860. New York: D. Dana. 8vo. pp. 36.

The position of the Church has seldom been more clearly and definitely stated, not only as holding the Faith and Ministry of the Gospel, but as teaching certain practical duties in these our own troublous times. Upon one point, alluded to in this Address, we desire to express ourselves clearly. That the North is sacredly bound, by the *letter* and *spirit* of the Constitution, "to deliver up" "persons held to service," who have escaped to the North, is certain; that, under the influence of strong sectional excitements, several of the Northern States have, in a greater or less degree, virtually violated this Constitutional compromise, is equally certain. And yet, just such "Fugitive Slave Laws" existed, *and were enforced*, among the New England Colonies themselves, while slavery existed in those Colonies. (See

Curtis' History of the Constitution, Vol. II., p. 454.) The South, undoubtedly, the right to hold the North to a strict compliance with that Article of the Con tion. Daniel Webster went down to his grave, the victim of a sectional and persecution, for being true to his own most solemn oath in this matter. This "H er law" notion, however, which is no new thing in the history of both Church State, cares little for the sanctity of oaths, when they stand in the way of its designs. On the subject of Slavery, opinion has changed somewhat, and has become greatly intensified, within the last twenty-five years, both in the N and the South. The perpetuity of our Union depends, under God, on a strict herence to our Constitutional Compact, as interpreted by the Supreme Court. the present excitement, greater than has ever been known in the history of country, our devout hope is, that Congress, which is assembling while we w may devise such measures as shall be a sure basis of harmony amid conflicting terests and feelings, and that God, Who "maketh men to be of one mind in a hous will so turn the hearts of the people, that the appalling dangers, which now thre en our country, may be averted. Hitherto we have religiously and steadfa avoided the introduction of party politics into our pages; but, in times like thes we do not hesitate to express ourselves clearly and unequivocally.

REV. S. M. HASKINS' PASTORAL OFFERING, on the 21st Anniversary of his Past rate in St. Mark's Church, Williamsburgh, N. Y., Oct. 28, 1860.

This modest, appropriate record of twenty-one years of Pastoral life, shows what a faithful, quiet, unostentatious, but zealous working of the Church will a complish. In these days of "clerical changes," it is delightful to witness such sta bility of position, attended, too, with such rich results. The contrast between th influence of such a man, and that of one of the "sensation preachers," the clerical demagogues of the day, of the "flash school," is as great as it can be. Both have, or will have, their reward.

ADDRESS TO THEIR BRETHREN OF THE LAITY of the P. E. Church, by the Lay Committee appointed at the Session of the General Convention, Oct., 1860. Philadelphia: King & Baird. 8vo. pp. 23.

We take the liberty to ask of the parochial Clergy of the Church, that they will in some way bring this address before their several congregations. It is thoroughly earnest; it recognizes the Church as a living Body; and it cannot fail, with God's blessing, to stir up in the hearts of her members a warmer zeal for the cause of Christ and the salvation of men.

BISHOP OTEY'S SERMON on "The Christian Ministry." Edited by WILLIAM A. Dod, D. D. New York: Daniel Dana. 1860. 18mo. pp. 48.

This masterly statement of a great argument, suited to our times, by Bishop Otey, derives additional value in the matter contributed by the Rev. Dr. Dod, who, as is well known, has lately conformed to the Church. And, with all charity for those among our Clergy who are seeking in every possible way to destroy the moral power of our Church position in this country, we beg to commend to them the following extract from Dr. Dod's Introduction.

"It is simply a fact, that to the Episcopal Church, and to no other, is owing the preservation of the Reformed doctrine, which is the catholic truth. It was my own

...it, for a long time, to attribute this remarkable fact to the mere moral and disciplinary influence of the Prayer Book—not stopping to ask how that Prayer Book came to possess so wonderful a Liturgic embodiment of the truth, nor how it happened that the Liturgy itself has continued in actual use, notwithstanding the constant tendency of the rational mind to impugn its truth. I must confess, that I found no explanation of the phenomenon, except in the consideration that the Liturgy, which has preserved the Catholic truth concerning the Christian Sacraments, was preserved by, and has continued to be under the care of, that Order of Ministry to which the sacramental commission was at first entrusted."

ACCOUNT OF THE PROCEEDINGS AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNER-STONE OF THE HOSPITAL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN PHILADELPHIA, on Thurday, May 24th, A. D., 1860. Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead. 1860.

To this pamphlet, and especially to the admirable Address of the Rev. Dr. Stevens, as introducing the whole subject of "Church Homes," we hope to give attention hereafter.

INVOLUNTARY CONFESSIONS, A Monograph. By FRANCIS WHARTON. Philadelphia: 1860. pp. 34.

REV. N. M. WILLIAMS' Review of Rev. Dr. Huntington's Sunday School Address at Worcester.

REV. DR. C. H. HALL'S Funeral Sermon on the death of Rev. L. T. Gillis, in the Church of the Epiphany, Washington City, May 13, 1860.

REV. Dr. W. B. STEVEN'S Sermon in behalf of the Church Mission to the Jews, in Ascension Church, N. Y. City, May 27, 1860.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EPISCOPAL MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION FOR THE WEST. Philadelphia: 1860.

REGISTER OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES. 1860.

MESSRS. CARLTON & PORTER, Publishers of Methodist Books, New York City, send us the following new Works, which we can only give by their titles.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW AND MARK. Intended for popular use. By D. D. WHEDON, D. D. 12mo. pp. 422.

THE HOMILIST: A Series of Sermons for Preachers and Laymen. Original and Selected. By ERWIN HOUSE, A. M. 12mo. pp. 496.

HISTORY OF THE GREAT REFORMATION in England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, France and Italy. By REV. THOMAS CARTER. 12mo. pp. 372.

EARLY METHODISM, within the bounds of the Old Genesee Conference, from 1788 to 1828. By GEORGE PECK, D. D. 12mo. pp. 512.

THE LIFE OF JACOB GRUBER. By W. P. STRICKLAND. 12mo. pp. 384.

A Missionary among Cannibals; Or the Life of John Hunt, Missionary among the Fijians. By George Stringer Rowe. 12mo. pp. 286.

The Missionary in Many Lands. A Series of interesting Sketches of Missionary Life. By Erwin House, A. M. 12mo. pp. 393.

Little Songs for Little People, With numerous illustrations. 12mo. pp. 256.

Light in the Valley, Or the Life and Letters of Mrs. Hannah Bocking. By Miss M. Annesley. 12mo. pp. 176.

Common Place Book, Designed to assist Students, Professional Men, &c., in treasuring up knowledge for future use. Arranged by Rev. James Porter, D. D. With an Introduction, by Rev. William Rice, A. M. 4to. pp. 400.

The following Books have also been received:

Hints on the Formation of Religious Opinions, addressed especially to young Men and Women of Christian Education. By Rev. Ray Palmer, D. D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Albany. New York: Sheldon & Co. pp. 324.

The Oakland Stories. Claiborne. By George B. Taylor, of Virginia. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860. 18mo. pp. 180.

The Junior Ladies' Reader, A choice and varied Collection of Prose and Verse; with a Synopsis of the Elementary Principles of Elocution, especially adapted for the use of the young. By John W. S. Hows, Professor of Elocution. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1860. 12mo. pp. 312.

Analysis of the Cartoons of Raphael. New York: C. B. Norton. 1860. 12mo. pp. 141.

Evan Harrington; Or, He would be a Gentleman. By George Meredith. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. 12mo. pp. 491.

"My Novel," By Pisistratus Caxton, or, Varieties in English Life. Library Edition. Two vols. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. pp. 589, 581.

Tom Brown at Oxford. A Sequel to School Days at Rugby. By the Author of "School Days at Rugby," "Scouring of the White Horse," &c., &c., &c.. Part First. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860. pp. 360.

Note.—Several publications were received too late for Notice in this Number.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Bolton, John,	Potter, H.	Nov. 10, 1860,	Christ, Pelham, N. Y.
Gilbert, Chas. A.	Whitehouse,	Sept. 12, "	St. John's, Quincy, Ill.
Guilford, W. M.	Otey,	Sept. 23, "	Trinity, Winchester, Tenn.
Hickox, Wm. Henry,	Lee, H. W.	Oct. 14, "	St. Luke's, Davenport, Iowa.
Jagger, Thos. Augustus,	Potter, H.	Nov. 10, "	Christ, Pelham, N. Y.
Kellogg. Day Otis, Jr.,	Potter, H.	Sept. 30, "	Christ, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lee, John N.	Bedell,	Oct. 30, "	Grace, Sandusky, Ohio.
Mansfield, Francis,	Potter, H.	Nov. 11, "	Holy Apostles, New York City.
Middleton, John C.	Clark,	Sept. 21, "	Grace, Providence, R. I.
Ormsby, Duke C.	Potter, H.	Nov. 10, "	Christ, Pelham, N. Y.
Smith, Dennis,	Potter, H.	Nov. 16, "	St. Luke's, New York City.
Todd, Russell,	DeLancey,	Nov. 4, "	Calvary, Utica, W. N. Y.
Waterman, John H.	Smith,	Nov. 18, "	Ascension, Frankfort, Ky.

PRIESTS.

Name.	*Bishop.*	*Time.*	*Place.*
Rev. Chrystal, James,	Lee, A.	July 20, 1860,	St. John's, Brandywine, Del.
" Clemson, Thos. G.	Lee, A.	Nov. 30, "	St. John's, Brandywine, Del.
" *Dudley, H. C. H.	Bedell,	July 1, "	St. Peter's, Ashtabula, Ohio.
" Helm, J. J.	Potter, A.	Nov. 16, "	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
" High, Nath'l R.	Upfold,	Oct. 17, "	St. John's, LaFayette, Ind.
" Jarratt, Jas. S.	Cobbs,	Sept. 21, "	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
" Johnson, W. Young,	Lee, H. W.	Nov. 23, "	St. Paul's, Durant, Iowa.
" Lewis, John V.	Eastburn,	Sept. 26, "	Grace, Millville, Mass.
" Lord, Wm. H.	DeLancey,	Nov. 14, "	Christ, Manlius, W. N. Y.
" McKim, John L.	Odenheimer,	Nov. 4, "	House of Prayer, Newark, N.J.
" Randolph, Alfred M.	Johns,	Nov. 18, "	St. George's, Fredericksb'g, Va.
" Rising, Franklin S.	Potter, H.	Nov. 11, "	Holy Apostles, New York City.
" Scott, David,	Potter, H.	Nov. 8, "	St. John's, Lewisboro, N. Y.
" Strong, Geo. A.	Lee, A.	Nov. 30, "	St. John's, Brandywine, Del.
" Tatlock, William,	Potter, H.	Nov. 11, "	Holy Apostles, New York City.
" Tustin, I. P.	Clark,	Sept. 21, "	Grace, Providence, R. I.
" Williams, Chas. S.	Potter, H.	Sept. 30, "	Christ, Brooklyn, N. Y.

* Incorrectly reported in the Oct. No.

1809, by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Moore, the then Bishop of New York. Dr. Empie's first ministerial charge was in the town of Hempsted, on Long Island, where he was also employed a part of his time in the business of classical instruction. Among his pupils, while at Hempsted, was the Rt. Rev. Dr. DeLancey, the present Bishop of Western New York. In 1811, Dr. Empie was invited to take charge of St. James' Parish, Wilmington, and, in 1813, was here married to Miss Wright, who has preceded him by several years to the grave. His first residence in Wilmington embraced a period of about three years, at the expiration of which he received the appointment of Chaplain and Professor of Rhetoric in the U. S. Military Academy, at West Point. In 1815, he was again invited to take charge of St. James' Parish, Wilmington, where he continued to perform the duties of Rector until the year 1827, when, upon the death of the Rev. Dr. Wilmer, President of the College of William and Mary, Va., Dr. Empie was called to succeed him in that office. In 1836, he resigned the Presidency of William and Mary, and, after a temporary engagement as Principal of the Diocesan School at Raleigh, removed in 1837 to Richmond, Va., in which city he organized a congregation, who built for him the present church of St. James. He continued to be Rector of this parish until his loss of health compelled him to retire from the active duties of his ministry. He returned to Wilmington in 1859, to reside in the family of his son, (Adam Empie, Jr., Esq.,) and "to die," as he expressed himself, "among the friends of his early ministry."

Both physically and mentally, Dr. Empie has emphatically led a laborious life, and, through the whole course of his long ministry, has suffered from disease and debility, under which nothing but the power of religion could have sustained him. In all the various spheres in which he has been called to act, his duties were performed most honorably to himself and usefully for the Church. He took an active part in the organization of the Church in N. C., and represented that of Virginia on several occasions in the General Convention.

In 1856 he published a Volume of Sermons, preached during a Ministry of forty-four years. In noticing those Sermons at the time, we spoke of him as "a well-educated scholar, an earnest, sound divine, a rubrical Churchman, and an evangelical preacher." For several months previous to his death, he was entirely confined to his bed or chair, but, under his protracted sufferings, he exhibited the humble submission of the devoted Christian. When near his departure, and deprived of the power of speech, he signified by signs that he desired to be furnished with paper and pen, and wrote legibly with his dying hand, the following sentences—"I die in Jesus. Welcome Lord Jesus. Farewell to all our beloved absent ones. Come Lord Jesus—come quickly. My trust is in His atoning blood."

After a pause of some hours, he wrote again—"I thank God that he has heard my prayers and granted my last request, enabling me to die easily. To die is gain."

The Rev. Daniel Long Ingraham died in Augusta, Me., Nov. 23, 1860, aged 30 years. He was born in Augusta, in 1830, of Baptist parents; graduated at Bowdoin College in 1850, and was for a short time a minister of the Baptist denomination. He then conformed to the Church, and was ordained Deacon by Bishop Burgess, in Christ Church, Gardiner, July 14, 1858. After a brief and promising exercise of his ministry in the parishes of Trinity Church, Saco, and Trinity Church, Lewiston, disease interrupted his labors, and he retired from the work on which his heart was bent. He was a good man, and his last days were full of the peace of God.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MISSIONS.

The Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Board of Missions of the Church, was held at St. Paul's Church, in the city of New Haven, commencing Wednesday, Oct. 10, at 5 P. M.

DOMESTIC COMMITTEE.—The Reports of the Domestic Committee and the Missionary Bishops of the West were read by Dr. Hawks, the Rev. Dr. Van Kleeck, the Secretary and General Agent, being absent, owing to illness.

The first-mentioned report stated that twenty-five stations were now vacant; thirty-three missionaries have been newly appointed during the year; nineteen have resigned; three Missionary Bishops and one hundred and thirty-seven missionaries are now employed in the field.

As to the funds, the amount, $75,230 93, is greater by $4,000 than ever before, and the number of contributing parishes is increased by fifty-five.

FOREIGN COMMITTEE.—The report of the Foreign Committee was read by the Rev. Mr. Denison, the Secretary and General Agent. It showed the receipts to have been $85,389 07; being $14,087 09 less than last year.

CHINA MISSION.—The statistics of the China Mission are:—*Clergy*—Bishop, three Presbyters, eight Deacons, (two Chinese,) twelve in all. Candidates for Orders, four, (two American and two Chinese;) single ladies, five; Baptisms, (adults thirty-one, infants four,) thirty-five; Communicants, (foreign twenty-one, native, sixty-nine,) ninety; Marriage, one; Day Schools—male, six, female, three; Boarding Schools, two, one male and one female, with forty pupils each.

JAPAN.—Two ordained missionaries and one physician.

AFRICAN MISSION.—The general statistics of the African Mission are:—Missionaries—foreign, (including the Bishop,) four, colonist, five, native, one. Total, ten. Assistant Missionaries—one Physician, (colored,) white female assistants, eight, colonist, male and female, eleven, native do., nineteen. Total, thirty-nine. Candidates for Orders—colonist, four, native, three. Total, seven. Confirmations—forty-two. Communicants—(returns imperfect,) colonist, about two hundred and twenty, native, about one hundred and fifty, foreign, twelve. Total, three hundred and eighty-two. Scholars—colonist, Boarding, forty-five, Day, three hundred. Native, Boarding, one hundred and thirty, Day, two hundred and eight. Total, six hundred and eighty-three.

The Meeting was one of more than ordinary interest.

A Mission to the Sandwich Islands was recommended, and the Foreign Committee instructed to establish one. Some facts were stated, and more might have been given, showing that there is an important portion of the population in the Islands, who desire the establishment of the Church.

The Domestic Committee were directed to confer with the "American Church Missionary Society," with a view to harmonize their various relations.

The Committee reported, that the Spanish and Portuguese translations of the Prayer Book were completed and stereotyped, the stereotyping of the former being paid for, through the kindness of Mr. and Miss Bohlen, of Philadelphia. The Rev. Mr. Holden has been detained by these works, but is now awaiting an opportunity to embark for Brazil.

The Special Committee on the Report of the Domestic Committee reported some stirring Resolutions, which called forth much feeling.

It was determined at this Meeting that an appointment to either of the Committees does *not* vacate the seat of an elected member of the Board.

The confidence of the Board in the Greek Mission was strongly evinced.

The Rev. Mr. Abercrombie read an important Report on Missions among the Germans in this country.

CHURCH COLONY IN HAYTI.

The Rev. James T. Holly, (a colored man,) Rector of St. Luke's Parish, in New Haven, Conn., has issued a Circular, from which we extract, as follows:

"It may be known to the American public generally, that great inducements are now being offered by the Haytien Government to the people of African and Indian descent in the United States, to emigrate to that Island. Several hundred persons of this description have already emigrated thither from Louisiana, during the past and present years, and others are preparing to follow from that and other States, during the forthcoming year. Commissioners of Emigration have already been appointed, to superintend and provide for the embarkation of such emigrants to Hayti.

Among others, a number of Church families, consisting of colored persons, resident in New Haven, Ct., and other places, are preparing to remove to that Island, in May, 1861. In the fear of God, and by the approbation of my Bishops, I have resolved, as a Presbyter of the Church, to cast my lot in with them. We propose to organize a parish under the provisions of Title 3, Canon 5, Section 3, of the Revised Canons of the General Convention of the Prot. Epis. Church in the United States."

The state of morals in Hayti may be inferred from the following:

An official Haytien document, giving the number of births, deaths, marriages and divorces in various villages in different parts of the Empire, during three months, shows that the whole number of children born in three months was 1,900, of whom 1,740 were born out of wedlock. In Port au Prince, the capital, out of 420 children born, only 30 were legitimate. If any country on the face of the earth, where the marriage institution is recognized, can exhibit such a monstrous disproportion between the legitimate and illegitimate births, we know not where it is to be found.

CHURCH GROWTH.

The Church in Ohio.—We notice, with pleasure, that the Assistant Bishop of this large Diocese is rallying around him a noble band of Clergy, animated with fervent zeal in the work of Church extension. The following is from an account of a late meeting of a Convocation in Sandusky. "In the afternoon, all the Brethren met the Bishop for fraternal counsel, and the encouragement and strengthening of each other's hearts in mutual sympathy and prayer. The Rev. Mr. Holden made a detailed statement of his visit, under the appointment of the Missionary Committee of the Diocese, *to several of the North Western Counties, which were entirely destitute of the services of the Episcopal Church. In nearly every place visited, he had found the fields ripe for our entrance, and in several county seats of adjacent counties, there was an earnest expression of desire for our ministry, and pledges of contributions* to such an extent that the Association did not hesitate to ask the Missionary Committee to enlarge their operations so far as to send out two more Mis-

tions. Bishop Lay's Missionary Report, and his late Appeal for men in New Mexico, have stirred the hearts of Churchmen everywhere. He says: "This call is for men of energy and quiet devotedness—not for the sentimentalist. The romance will soon die out, and a stern reality be left, wherewith to grapple. It is for men who love the Gospel and the souls of men; who love the Church, her doctrine and worship, her Offices and Articles. Other tests I know not; and from Church politicians in the missionary field, may a merciful Lord deliver us!"

The above statements are cheering. If Churchmen can only learn to love CHRIST and the Church and the souls of men, better than they love party, and if they will have confidence in, and charity for their brethren, great blessings are in store for us.

And yet, to show how little hold the Church, as yet, has upon the great masses of the people, we give the following, as we find it, concerning the State of New Jersey. Other dioceses would show a much worse record. "The new topographical map of New Jersey contains interesting statements, relative to the different religious denominations in the State. The capacities of the church edifices of the various denominations are thus given: Methodist, 109,350; Presbyterian, 81,650; Baptist, 43,425; Dutch Reformed, 39,156; Episcopal, 16,647; Roman Catholic, 9,485; Congregational, 3,500; Friends, 25,545; Universalist, 1,000; Union, 1,450; Lutheran, 2,900; Free, 2,400; Christian, 2,835; Unitarian, 450.

LAYING THE CORNER STONE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

On Wednesday, Oct. 10th, the Corner Stone of this University was laid at Sewanee, Tenn., with appropriate ceremonies, as follows. The Rt. Rev. Bishops OTEY, SMITH, POLK, ELLIOT, COBBS, GREEN, RUTLEDGE, and ATKINSON, were present and took part in the Services. A great number of Clergymen were in attendance, and the whole number of persons was estimated at from 3,000 to 5,000. At 11 o'clock, A. M., the procession was formed, under the command of Chief Marshal Maj. A. M. Rutledge, and proceeded, to the music of the band, from the Executive Office to the site of the principal building, in the following order: Horn's Silver Band; Citizens of Franklin, and Counties adjacent; Invited Guests; Architect; Ministers of the Gospel; Presidents of Colleges and Professors; the Ladies; the Trustees; the Orator of the Day and other Speakers; Bishops, in order of seniority. The Right Rev. Bishop Otey began the Services by announcing the 79th Selection, ("With one consent," etc.,) which was sung by the choir, accompanied by the band. Appropriate sentences from Scripture were then read by Bishop Rutledge, of Florida, and the usual exhortation delivered by Bishop Atkinson, of North Carolina. Bishop Cobbs, of Alabama, then said several Collects. The choir then sang the 79th Selection, being the 100th Psalm of David.

Bishop Elliot, of Georgia, announced the deposits in the corner-stone, and, in naming the articles to be deposited, made such remarks respecting each as was deemed suitable and appropriate. The following were the articles deposited in the metal casket, before it was fitted into its proper place: The Holy Bible; the Book of Common Prayer; the Constitution of the United States; the Journal of the General Convention of 1859, with the Constitution and Canons; the latest Journals of the Dioceses of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Tennesee; documents, pertaining to the founding of the University, copies of Church Review, Protestant Episcopal Quarterly, South-

New Jersey, Bristow, of Kentucky, Nelson, of Tennessee, Dunn, of Indiana, Taylor, of Louisiana, Kellogg, of Illinois, Houston, of Alabama, Phelps, of Missouri, Rust, of Arkansas, Howard, of Michigan, Hamilton, of Texas, Curtis, of Iowa, Burch, of California, Windham, of Minnesota, Stout, of Oregon.

The following voted, NAY; Adams, of Massachusetts, Humphrey, of New York, Ferry, of Connecticut, Robinson, of Rhode Island, Tappan, of New Hampshire, Morrill, of Vermont, Morse, of Maine, Washburne, of Wisconsin. Davis, of Mississippi, and Boyce of S. C., refused to vote.

It is significant that New England voted in a body against the Resolution; and were sustained only by Washburne, of Wisconsin, and Humphrey, of New York, (both New England men.) That these eight men misrepresent the great majority of the people of their several States, we regard as certain. An examination of this "Higher Law," theory, as illustrated in history, both in Church and State, its ultimate results, and the verdict of the people concerning it, when it has been fairly tried, would suggest some valuable lessons, at the present crisis.

JOHN WESLEY'S PRAYER BOOK.

In the possession of the Rev. Dr. Johnson, Rector of Grace Church, Jamaica, N. Y., is a copy of the PRAYER BOOK which Wesley prepared for the Methodists of North America. A late writer thus describes it. It was "The SUNDAY SERVICE of the METHODISTS in NORTH AMERICA, with other occasional services. London: Printed in the year MDCCLXXXIV." There is a frontispiece of Mr. Wesley, in his canonicals, a steel engraving, and I copy the preface: "I believe there is no LITURGY in the World, either in any ancient or modern language, which breathes more of a solid, scriptural, rational piety than the Common Prayer of the Church of England. And, though the main of it was compiled considerably more than two hundred years ago, yet is the language of it not only pure, but strong and elegant in the highest degree. Little alteration is made in the following edition of it, (which I recommend to our societies in *America*,) except in the following instances:—

"1. Most of the holy-days (so called,) are omitted, as at present answering no valuable end.

"2. The service for the Lord's Day, the length of which has been often complained of, is considerably shortened.

"3. Some sentences in the Office of Baptism, and for the Burial of the Dead, are omitted. And,

"4. Many psalms are left out, and part of the others, as being highly improper for the mouths of a Christian congregation. JOHN WESLEY.

"BRISTOL, Sept. 9th, 1784."

After the selection of Psalms, is printed the "Form and Manner of Making and Ordaining of SUPERINTENDENTS, ELDERS, and DEACONS."

The volume is bound in red morocco and gilt, with the name of PETER ROOSEVELT on the cover, and is a sort of valued heir-loom, excellently preserved, in the family. This is the Prayer Book, which Mr. Wesley prepared for the American Methodists —an abridgement of the English Liturgy, to be used when the Methodist Episcopal denomination was organized. The forms of ordination for Deacons, Presbyters, and Bishops, are taken from the English Liturgy, the names of the last two being changed into Elders and Superintendents.

NEW COLONIAL BISHOPRICS.

NEW DIOCESE IN AUSTRALIA.—Arrangements are in progress for the erection of a new bishopric in Australia, the seat of which will be, in all probability, at Goulburn. The Bishop of Sydney, writing home on the subject, states that the Church lands there have become so valuable as to afford a reasonable hope that a suitable endowment and a proper cathedral may be secured.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel have determined to set apart £10,000 for the endowment of the Episcopal Colonial churches.

BISHOP OF THE ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC.—The Rev. John Coleridge Patterson, M. A., formerly Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, son of the Right Hon. Sir John Patterson, late one of Her Majesty's Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, has been nominated Bishop of the Islands of the Pacific, acting under the direction of the Bishop of New Zealand. The Rev. gentleman graduated in 1848. Afterwards he went to New Zealand, where he became Chaplain to Bishop Selwyn, and Missionary of the Northern Mission of that Diocese. He was to be consecrated about Christmas, and will exercise Episcopal supervision over seventy or eighty islands of the Pacific, not under the British Crown. The Rev. gentleman has been for the last five years in the habit of visiting these islands, has made himself acquainted with six or seven of the principal languages prevailing there, and has always been gladly welcomed by the natives.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

From the Annual Report for 1859, we gather the following. The number of Missionaries now in the employ of the Society is 414; of Catechists, Schoolmasters, etc., is over 700; making the whole list over 1,114. The income of the Society last year was £102,592, or over $510,000.

The Colonial Episcopate and Missionaries sustained by the Society, are as follows:—

Diocese.	Colony.	No. of Missionaries.
Nova Scotia,	Nova Scotia, 36 Cape Breton, 2 Prince Edward's Island, 5	43
Newfoundland,	Newfoundland, 32 Labrador, 2 Bermuda, 2	36
Fredericton,	New Brunswick,	41
Quebec,	Canada East,	28
Montreal,	Canada East,	41
Toronto,	Canada West,	1
Huron,	Canada West,	6
Rupert's Land,	Hudson's Bay Territory,	2
Columbia,	British Columbia,	3
Jamaica,	Jamaica, 4 Bahamas, 5	9
Antigua,	Antigua, Montserrat, etc.,	0
Barbados,	Barbados, Trinidad, etc.,	4
Guiana,	Demarara, Essequibo, and Berbice,	13
Capetown,	Cape of Good Hope,	23

waits for a sufficient number of well-qualified Candidates to make a still larger addition to its expenditure in India, which must ever be regarded as the great Mission-field of the English Church. But to India, another still more vast and populous country must be added, and China is now opened to the heralds of the Cross. All Asia, indeed, and all Africa may now be said to be waiting for the message of the Gospel; and, great as the work is, it is not surely beyond what is promised to faith and prayer.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY. SIXTY-FIRST YEAR.

The last Report enables us to give the following details of the present operations of this Society.

Sierra Leone Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 15; European Missionaries, 9; Native Missionaries, 8; European Teachers, 9; Country-born and Native Teachers, 15; Communicants, 3,693; Seminaries and Schools, 3; Seminarists and Scholars, 26.

Yoruba Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 7; European Missionaries, 6; Native Missionaries, 6; European Lay Teachers, 6; Native Teachers, 46; Communicants, 916; Schools, 16; Scholars, 555.

Niger Mission. *Summary*—Station, 1; Native Missionary, 1; Native Teachers, 6; Scholars. 24.

Mediterranean Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 9; European Missionaries, 9; European Lay Teachers, 3; Native Teachers, 11; Communicants, 35; Schools and Scholars, (returns incomplete.)

Western India Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 7; European Missionaries, 14; East-India and Native Missionaries, 5; European Lay Teachers, 3; East-India and Native Teachers, 39; Communicants, 108; Schools, 17; Scholars, 987.

North India Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 30; European Missionaries, 54; Native Missionaries, 4; European Lay Teachers, 3; Native and Country-born Teachers, 393; Communicants, 900; Schools, 138; Scholars, 8,682.

South India Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 27; European Missionaries, 30; Native and East-Indian Missionaries, 25; European Laymen, 9; European Female Teachers, 3; East-Indian and Native Teachers, 768; Communicants, 6,031; Schools, 435; Scholars, 11,692.

Ceylon Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 7; European Missionaries, 10; Native Missionaries, 2; European Lay Teachers, 2; Native Teachers, 193; Communicants, 541; Schools, 106; Scholars, 3,723.

Mauritius Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 2; European Missionaries, 2; Native Teachers, 4; Communicants, 21; Schools, 3; Scholars, 68.

China Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 3; European Missionaries, 8; Native Teachers, 9; Communicants, 69; Schools, 6; Scholars, 138.

New Zealand Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 22; European Missionaries, 24; Native Missionaries, 2; European Catechists, and others, 4; Native Teachers, 565; Communicants, 6,582; Schools and Scholars, (returns incomplete.)

North-West America Mission. *Summary*—Stations, 13; European Missionaries, 12; Native Missionaries, 4; European Laymen, 3; Country-born and Native Teachers, 23; Communicants, 776; Schools, 23; Scholars, 783.

Catholic and Protestant; Catholic, as maintaining the faith and discipline of the Holy Catholic Church; Protestant, in rejecting Papal usurpation and dogma."

It is probable that there is a good deal of political feeling at present in the North of Italy, to which these views would not be displeasing.

In connection with the above, it may be stated, that application having been made to Garibaldi, by English residents at Naples, for permission to erect a Church within the Capital, the Dictator not only granted the request, but gave an eligible lot of ground on which to build it.

The Rev. M. A. Camilleri, Curate to the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster Abbey, is about to proceed to Italy, as one of several agents, who will be accredited to carry out the new English Mission amongst the Italian people. Mr. Camilleri was educated at Malta College, and is reported to be well qualified for the duties he is about to discharge.

ITALY.

Events of the greatest possible importance have lately transpired in Southern Italy. A decree was published, ordering a vote to be taken in the Two Sicilies on the 21st of October, by universal suffrage, on the following question: "Do you wish Italy to be indivisibly united, with Victor Emanuel as constitutional king, and his legitimate descendants?"

In the provinces of Naples proper, the votes stood: Ayes, 1,302,064; Noes, 10,312. In Sicily, there were 432,054 *for* Annexation, and 667 against it. King Victor Emanuel has published a proclamation to the Neapolitan and Sicilian peoples, accepting the sovereign authority of the Two Sicilies, transferred to him by universal suffrage. On the 7th of Nov., his Majesty, accompanied by Garibaldi, entered Naples. They proceeded together to the Cathedral, and afterward to the Palace. An immense crowd of people assembled, notwitstanding the torrents of rain which were falling. There were great festivities, and universal joy was apparent. A Naples telegram of Nov. 8th gives the following particulars: "On the entry of the King into Naples, Garibaldi sat at his side in the carriage. On the following morning, (the 8th,) Garibaldi, accompanied by the Ministry, formally presented to the King the result of the *plebiscite*. His majesty received them in the throne-room. Signor Conforti addressed the King thus: 'Sire, the Neapolitan people, assembled in their electoral committee, having proclaimed you King by an immense majority, 9,000,000 Italians are uniting themselves to the other provinces, which your Majesty governs with so much wisdom, verifying your solemn promise, that Italy should belong to the Italians.' The King replied in a few expressive words. The deed of annexation was then drawn up, the dictatorship ceased, and the ministry resigned. The enthusiasm of the people continued."

A Naples despatch of the 9th announces that Garibaldi left Naples that morning, for his home at the Island of Caprera. In the Spring he threatens to attack Venice and Rome. The efforts of Mazzini, Louis Blanc, and other red republicans and socialists in Naples, had called forth the strongest marks of disapprobation, on the part of the majority of the people; and the rumored break between Victor Emanuel and Garibaldi is said to be owing to the sympathy of the latter with these ultra-radicals. The unity of Italy, with the solitary exception of Venitia, is now nearly a consummated fact.

CONVOCATION OF THE PROVINCE OF YORK.

It is now reported that Lord Palmerston has signified to Archbishop Longley, that the Convocation of York is to be accorded the same privileges as those granted to the Province of Canterbury. The Archbishop is too good a man not to improve the opportunity.

SCOTLAND: DIOCESE OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES.

On the 30th of June a meeting was held at London House, to hear a statement, by the Bishop, regarding the position of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Argyll and the Isles, on the West coast of Scotland.

There were present, their Graces, the Lords Archbishops of Canterbury, Armagh, and York; the Lords Bishops of London, Chichester, Bangor, Sodor and Man; the Ven. Archdeacon Hale, the Rev. J. E. Kempe, rector of St. James's; the Rev. J. Ewing, Westmill; the Rev. J. C. Wynter, rector of Gatton; the Revs. T. B. Murray and J. D. Glennie, of the Christian Knowledge Society; the Rev. F. D. Maurice, of Lincoln's Inn; the Right Hon. R. C. N. Hamilton, the Hon. G. F. Boyle; Sir John Maxwell, Bart.; William Stirling, Esq., M. P.; J. C. Grant, Esq., of Kilgraston; Augustus Vansittart, Esq.; Alexander Ewing, Esq. Letters of regret for unavoidable absence, and expressions of sympathy and promises of coöperation (from the greater number) were read, from the Bishops of Winchester, Lincoln, Oxford, Bath and Wells, Durham, (Dr. Montagu Villiers,) Cashel and Jamaica, and from many others. The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles described the diocese as comprehending the territory, stretching from the northern extremity of the island of Lewis to the southern part of Kintyre, a distance of upwards of 230 miles, and from the island of Tyree on the west, to Lochaber on the east, a space of not less than 120 miles in breadth. It is a land of great beauty and interest—"a land of hills and valleys, drinking water of the rain of heaven"—the land of the labors of St. Columba and the early Scottish Missionaries—containing the island of Iona and the ancient seats of the Bishop of Sodor and Argyll. Once the Church of the West Highlands, Iona, and the early Scottish Missionaries had supplied the wants of England; now it would appear that England was ready to repay that debt. Among the difficulties under which the Scottish Church labors, is the fact, that, while most of the great landowners and the ancient aristocracy of Scotland are Episcopalian, but with few exceptions they take very little interest in their own Church. Many landowners suppose that they have to maintain the Presbyterian Establishment out of their own incomes, forgetting that land in Scotland is bought with deduction of value in proportion to its maintenance of the Establishment; and that such deduction was never the property of the landed estate, but is simply the discharge of a trust entailed upon it. The dissensions in that Church are also among the saddest drawbacks to her progress. The meeting was in all respects an encouraging one.

CHURCH IN UPPER CANADA.

On Tuesday, June 12, the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, met in that city. More than a hundred Clergymen and ninety-two Lay delegates, attended the Synod, and the proceedings were of the most satisfactory description. The Rt. Rev. and Venerable Prelate, Bishop Strachan, in his charge, thus describes the progress of the Church in Canada West.

"The general progress of the Church during all this time was much slower than might have been expected. In 1803, we had only five Clergymen in Upper Canada, and one Bishop for all Canada. In 1819, the Clergy had only increased to sixteen, with two military chaplains. During the French revolutionary wars, emigration was next to nothing, and they dropped in by single families. It was not till the American war of 1812, and after the peace of 1815, on the return of the troops to the mother country, that Canada became at all known, or that emigration began to commence in any strength from the United Kingdom of England and Ireland. It was indeed for many years very small and imperfect in arrangement, nor did it come to any greater strength till after 1831. Since then, it has been at times fluctuating, but on the whole very large, and attended with a proportional increase of the Clergy. In 1839, they numbered sixty-one, and 1857, just before the Bishopric of Huron was established, they reached one hundred and seventy-three, and at this time they are supposed to be rather more than two hundred, presided over by two Bishops, with the prospect of soon having a third. Looking at the progress of the Church through a vista of sixty years, I feel it most encouraging, and more especially because I can witness to its continued peace and moderation."

Funds for the endowment of the new Diocese have already been raised.

PARLIAMENTARY NEWS.

The Bill for the total abolition of Church rates came on for second reading in the House of Lords on Tuesday evening, June 19th. As was anticipated, it was rejected by a very large majority. The members were—for the bill 31, against it 128—majority against it, 97. The enemies of the Church, encouraged by their success in robbing the Church in Canada, intended in this measure nothing more nor less than a bill for the spoliation of the Church. If Parliament once assents to the abolition of Church rates, we do not understand on what principle it can maintain titles, and the various endowments of the National Church.

The Duke of Marlborough gave notice of a resolution, which he proposed on July 2d, with regard to the introduction of the Bible into the Government schools in India. He wishes the House of Lords to say that it is desirable, that under proper arrangements the Bible should be taught in all the government schools and colleges. Petitions in favor of the motion are being signed in all parts of the country.

In the Bill for taking the Census, the clause, which secured accuracy as to the religious denominations of the people, was so severely assailed by Dissenters, that it was abandoned by government.

In the last week of July, a bill was introduced into the House of Peers, by Lord Lyttleton, for the purpose of carrying into effect the recommendation of two Archbishops, the late Bishop of London, and the present Bishops of Durham and Oxford, and of the other Cathedral Commissioners, "that a permissive Bill should be introduced into Parliament, empowering Her Majesty to divide any diocese, under certain conditions and with the consent of the Bishop, where it is proposed to effect the division before the avoidance of the see." A memorial, setting forth the grounds of the measure, and bearing the signature of the Dukes of Marlborough and Buccleuch, and Lords Westminster, Carnarvon, Nelson, Verulam, Effingham, Galloway, Leigh, Eversley, Calthorpe, Ebury; Lord Robert Cecil, M. P.; Lord

John Manners, M. P.; Sir John Patteson, Sir J. T. Coleridge, the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, M. P.; Sir W. Page Wood; Sir Walter James, Bart., Sir William Heathcote, Bart., M. P.; the Right Hon. C. B. Adderly, the Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray, M. P.; C. J. Selwye, Esq., M. P.; Q. C.; S. T. Kekewich, Esq., M. P.; J. J. Rogers, Esq., M. P.; J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M. P.; Mr. Roundell Palmer, Q. C.; Mr. J. Markland, D. C. L.; Mr. William Cotton, Mr. Henry Hoare, Mr. H. F. Dickinson, Mr. W. S. Dogdale, Mr. Henry Kingscote, formerly Secretary of the Cathedral Commission,—has been addressed to the Prime Minister of the Crown, requesting him to support a legislative measure for that purpose. It has been signed unanimously by all the fourteen churchwardens of the different parishes in Coventry, and by all the magistrates but two; and a similar declaration has already received the signatures of more than six thousand clergy.

In this paper, the Memoralists say the Diocese of London contains more than two millions of souls; that diocese might be divided, and another see might be formed by converting the Collegiate Church of Westminster into a Cathedral Church, as it formerly was, and by raising the Dean to the dignity of a Bishop.

Another diocese which requires subdivision is that of Exeter. It is the most extensive of any in England and Wales; and the Cathedral city of Exeter is distant about 145 miles from the western extremity of the diocese. The present Bishop of the diocese has frequently expressed his desire for its subdivision, and has intimated his willingness to resign to a Bishop of Cornwall the episcopal preferment within that county.

Another similar instance may be found in the Diocese of Durham. Its population has increased with unexampled rapidity in the last few years. The Episcopal revenue of that diocese greatly exceeds the average of other sees; means might thence be derived for the subdivision of that populous diocese, and for the erection and endowment of an episcopal see in the town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and other favorable local circumstances might be mentioned, which would facilitate this result.

A desire has been manifested in the county of Hertford for the transformation of the ancient Abbey of St. Albans into a Cathedral Church; and it is very desirable, that the Bishop of Rochester should be more nearly connected, than at present, with his cathedral city; and that the clergy of the Kentish portion of the diocese should have easier access to their Bishop, than is now the case.

The Diocese of Lincoln, with its vast area and large number of clergy, is another diocese, which, as has been attested by its present Bishop, needs subdivision; and a Cathedral for a new diocese, to be taken out of that of Lincoln, would be found already prepared in the Collegiate Church of Southwell.

Wishes have also been expressed for the restoration of the city of Bristol as an independent episcopal see; and the existence of a cathedral with a Dean and Chapter in that city would promote the fulfillment of such a design.

We are also assured, that in the Archdeaconry of Coventry, which was annexed to the see of Worcester in 1836, and contains a population amounting to two-thirds of the diocese, there is a strong and general desire for the erection of a separate see on the next avoidance.

For this there is a prescriptive claim; Coventry was an Episcopal see seven hundred years; and one of the stately churches might suitably serve as a cathedral, and it is believed, that the funds required for endowment, in addition to what could be spared from the see of Worcester, would not be wanting.

printed with types closely resembling the original characters, and that the text should represent the *prima manus*, or the readings first written. All subsequent corrections and alterations are to be placed in the margin, as far as practicable, and the remainder will find a place in the commentary. To give a perfect idea of the appearance of the MSS., photographic and lithographic plates will be added, exhibiting no fewer than twenty of the more important pages. This work will be executed at Leipsic, by Giesecke and Devrient, whose skill in such undertakings is well known. There will be three volumes, of which the first and second will contain what remains of the Old Testament, and the third, the New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the fragments of the Pastor. A fourth volume will contain the *fac-similes*, prolegomena, and commentary. The commentary will treat of all the corrections, of which there are more than eight thousand. There will be three hundred copies printed, and all of them are to be sent to St. Petersburgh by the middle of 1862. Baber's edition of the Old Testament, of the Codex A, took fourteen years to execute, and Mai's, of Codex B, thirty years. The Codex Sinaticus is to appear in 1862, to commemorate the thousandth year of the Russian empire; it will not be sold, but the copies will be given for the use of the Christian Church in all the world.

For the comfort of those, who may not hope to possess or even see this splendid work, another edition is promised at the same time. This will be printed in modern Greek type, like the specimens which the volume now in our hands contains, and will be accompanied by the prolegomena somewhat abridged. Brockhaus, of Leipsic, will be the publisher, and the price will be very low. It will not, however, contain the Old Testament portion, which will be published afterwards.

The following are the books now extant in this extraordinary codex, in the order in which they stand: a leaf from 1 Chron. chaps. 9 to 11: six leaves of Tobit, from chap. 2 to the end, beginning where the Codex Friderico-Augustanus breaks off; Judith, in eight leaves; the first and fourth book of Maccabees; Isaiah, and six leaves of Jeremiah; nine of the minor prophets, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. These are followed by the poetical books, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Job. Next comes the New Testament—first the Gospels, then the Epistles of St. Paul, then the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and Revelation. Finally come the Epistle of Barnabas and the fragments of the Pastor. The Epistle to the Hebrews comes before those to Timothy; in other respects the order is the usual one. It is to be observed, also, that there are seven Catholic Epistles. The codex consists of 345 leaves and a half, of which 199 belong to the Old Testament, and 147 and a half (?) to the Christian documents.

With regard to the antiquity of the codex, Dr. T. stated, in the letter from Cairo, which announced its discovery, that it was of the *fourth* century, and that this was proved, by all the valid arguments to which appeal can be made in palæographic science. "This opinion," he remarks, "I can but repeat and confirm. To him that seeks for something more exact, it can only be doubtful whether the MS. was written before or after the middle of the fourth century." It is, therefore, in all probability, one hundred years older than our own famous Alexandrine Codex. Among the evidences for its extreme antiquity may be mentioned, first, the character of the writing, which accords with the oldest specimens, and, as such, is without large capitals, points, and other artificial distinctions, which make their appearance in

portions of the four Gospels, forming part of the MS. found by Dr. Tischendorf, on his first journey, and named Γ. The ninth is an octavo of 149 leaves, a lectionary of the Old Testament. The tenth, of 69 leaves, is part of a lectionary of the New Testament. The eleventh is eight leaves of the homilies of Chrysostom. The twelfth is one leaf, only, from some patristic book. The thirteenth is a leaf of Jeremiah. Seven others are parts of liturgies, evangelistarium, Fathers, &c.—*Thirdly*, Greek *cursive* MSS. First, 146 leaves of a Greek version of the Old Testament, apparently not the LXX. The second is a similar book, containing the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, with marginal notes to the former, referring to the *Hebrew* Gospel. The third is the Etymologicum of Suidas. The fourth is the four Gospels, (twelfth century,) almost complete. The fifth contains several ancient apocryphal writings. The sixth is a catena. The seventh, a commentary of Andreas, on the Revelation. The eighth is a part of a menology. The ninth, the martyrdom of St. Andrew, lives of Fathers, &c., is a volume of rare interest to the student of such lore. The tenth is a part of a lexicon. The eleventh is a part of a lectionary. The twelfth is a part of a collection of sermons, or essays. The thirteenth is two leaves from the First Book of Kings. The fourteenth is of a similar character to the twelfth. The fifteenth is part of a philosophical work in verse. No. 16 is a fragment of the Gospels. The seventeenth seems to refer to the Synod *in Trullo*. The eighteenth is miscellaneous fragments.

The *fourth* class of MSS. is Syriac. 1. Hymns and sundry discourses of Gregory Nazianzen. 2. Forty-three leaves from the three first Gospels, ancient. 3. A portion of a patristic work. 4. Fifteen leaves, containing hymns to Mary. 5 to 9. Fragments, partly patristic and partly liturgical.—*Fifthly*, Coptic MSS. 1 to 3. Very ancient fragments, mostly found in an Egyptian sepulchre. They contain part of an account of St. Victor, and the end of St. Luke, and beginning of John in Sahidic. Eight others are more recent, and chiefly liturgical.—*Sixthly*, Arabic and Turkish. The first is 151 leaves of a very ancient version of St. Paul's Epistles, belonging to a MS., of which seventy-five leaves were already at St. Petersburgh. No. 2 is a roll relating to historical matters. 3. Three leaves of the life of St. Luke, &c. 4. Two leaves from a patristic book. 5. Forty-one leaves of a Greek and Arabic lectionary. 6 to 8. Miscellaneous fragments.

Seventhly, Hebrew MSS. 1. Or Zarua, by R. Isaac, of Vienna, and another tract. 2 to 9. Various rabbinical treatises. 10. The Hebrew Bible of Bomberg, on vellum.—*Eighthly*, Samaritan. Two ancient copies of the Pentateuch, one perfect, the other defective.—*Ninthly*, Slavonic. Three fragments, two liturgical and one of the Psalms.—*Tenth*, Ethiopic. Of these there are eleven, of which one contains the Gospel of John; one the Revelation, and an account of Christ's descent into hell; one is patristic; and some are psalters, &c.—*Eleventh*, Armenian. Five in number, of which, two are psalters, two breviaries, and one miscellaneous.—*Twelfth*, various antiquities, consisting of papyri, inscriptions, &c. The most important is a Græco-Egyptian astrolabe, ascribed to the fourth century, and of this an engraving is added.

Such is the list of these remarkable discoveries.

The *Notitia* concludes with an account of an inedited MS. of Diodorus Siculus, and with a copy of the Greek scholia of Origen on the book of Proverbs. The MS. of Diodorus contains six books (xi. to xvi.) of his history, and is referred to the eleventh century. The scholia of Origen are from a MS. mentioned by H. O.